BAP
Q2
copy 1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/biblebaptismorim00qu

BIBLE BAPTISM,

OR

THE IMMERSER INSTRUCTED,

FROM

VARIOUS SOURCES.

BY

JAMES E. QUAW, A. M., V. D. M.

AUTHOR OF THE COLD-WATER-MAN, &c.

To the law and to the testimony—Isa. 8: 20.
Make all things according to the pattern—Heb 8: 5.
Truth is mighty and will prevail—Tertullian.
He who hates truth shall be the dupe of lies—Cowper.
Prove all things; hold fast that which is good—1 Thes. 5: 21.

DETROIT:
BENJAMIN WOOD, PUBLISHER.
GEIGER & CHRISTIAN, PRINTERS.
1844.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-four, by BENJAMIN WOOD and JAMES E. QUAW, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the District of Michigan.

PROEM.

Many of the materials for the following work were collected while the Author was traveling in primitive apostolic style in different parts of the great American valley. In these his ministerial journeyings, he usually preached six or eight times a week; while he often traveled on foot without purse or scrip or two coats, sometimes with scarcely one, often for days without bread, and occasionally without water. But the mighty God of Jacob was always with him.

This book was written in a western log-cabin; in a room which, at one and the same time, answered for a study, a parlor, a sitting-room a dining-hall, bed-room, and kitchen. The hours which, for six or eight months, the Author could spare from the discharge of the duties of a New Testament Bishop, he has, in this rather romantic study, devoted to this work. The reader must determine whether they have or have not been profitably employed. That the work required labor will be manifest to those who may read it with care. Indeed, this is evident from the single fact, that to complete it on the plan which the Author adopted, more or less words from twelve foreign languages, ancient and modern, have been introduced into the work.

The learned reader will perceive that for the sake of those who are not acquainted with any language except English, the Author has invariably so placed the words taken from foreign sources, that the mere English reader may omit them entirely without injuring, in the least, the sense of the passages where they are used. He will also perceive that in consequence of this, the style, in such passages, is not quite so smooth as it would otherwise have been, especially for such as read and understand both the foreign and English words. But such persons will be the last to find fault on this account.

This work was written to remove the rubbish that learning and ignorance and learned ignorance have thrown round a plain Scriptural truth and duty; and then to place these clearly before the reader's mind, with the evidence in their favor. It has not been written in answer to any book, or in opposition to any class of men. The subject of baptism has been examined with some degree of care. What men have said in favor of immersion being the only mode of baptism, has been brought to the test of truth and examined Their assertions, as a substitute for Scriptural evidence, often, when examined, appear ridiculous. But when this is the case, the fault is not in the truth, or in those who present it to the mind; but in those who, by mistake or otherwise, substitute unsupported assertions for Divine Revelation.

Many men have written well on different parts of the subject of baptism. The names of several of those are mentioned in this work. Not a few of them are an honor to the age and country to which they belong. The writer of this, honors and respects them. He does not wish to derogate from their usefulness or well-earned and justly-deserved fame. From the writings of some of them he has, with pleasure, made quotations. These, it is believed, are all acknowledged in the places where they are made. But while he cheerfully does all this, he humbly hopes the arrangement of the arguments in this work, together with the original matter introduced, will render it acceptable to all who love God's truth; notwithstanding the occasional repetition of an idea, in order to carry out the plan.

If this work is noticed publicly, by the friends or enemies of Divine truth, not with sneers, assertions or questions, but by facts and arguments which point out any error in the proof presented, or in the positions taken, the Author will be much obliged to those who do so. This will enable him to correct any mistakes or errors which it may contain. Those who "gnaw at the cover," quibble at trifles, or misrepresent what it contains, will only show what they would do if they could. That no man ever has or ever can prove immersion to be the only Scriptural mode of baptism, is certain; because the word of God makes no such declaration in any form of expression. But notwithstand-

ing this, when errors are discovered in the following work, the Author will cheerfully correct them.

This book, like most others, will, no doubt, fall into the hands of different kinds of readers. Some of these will be prejudiced, and therefore will not judge correctly. Some will be cynical. These can discover faults whether the book does or does not contain any. But such persons can neither discover nor correct real errors or mistakes. Those who are very ignorant will of course be very severe in their censures. The jealous will judge maliciously. The envious will judge with a jaundiced eye and an envenomed heart. Some who hate God's truth on this subject, will rage like the sea in a storm; while others among them will scatter their silent venom like the poison tree of fabulous notoriety. But such persons as love Divine truth, wherever they discover it, will examine candidly, judge impartially, and discover and correct errors with discretion; while they will perceive and acknowledge the force of evidence where it exists.

The whole subject of baptism has here been investigated. But particular attention has been paid to its mode and subjects. In the investigation, it has been shown that there is no Scriptural evidence to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Hence, to assert that it is so, is to utter a positive untruth. It has also been proved that no such notion existed for more than 1500 years after the birth of Christ. Moreover, it has been shown that sprinkling is a mode of baptism, expressly and repeatedly taught in the word of God; and that infants are definitely recognized as proper persons to receive this ordinance.

The Author has divided this work into Books, Parts, Chapters and Sections. He has attempted to have, in each Section, a complete argument on the subject mentioned in the Chapter; in each Chapter, a class of arguments relating to the subject of the Part; in each Part, a number of classes of arguments, each relating to that of which the Book treats; and each Book contains a leading branch of the subject of baptism. This is the plan. The reader will determine for himself how far it has been successfully executed.

That the Lord may accompany this work with the enlightening, regenerating, converting and sanctifying influences of His Spirit, is the sincere prayer of

THE AUTHOR.

Redford, (Mich.,) June 30th, 1844.

CONTENTS.

	Book.	Part.	Chap.
Baptism with water,	I.	I.	1.
The duration of Baptism,	I.	I.	2.
Baptism unto Moses,	I.	II.	1.
Divers Baptisms,	I.	II.	2.
John's Baptism,	I.	III.	1.
Baptism administered to Christ,	I.	III.	2.
Baptism administered by Him and by the apostles before His resurrection,	I.	III.	3.
Christian Baptism,	I.	IV.	1.
Doctrine of Baptism; one Baptism; Baptism for the dead;	I.	IV.	2.
Baptism without water,	I.	V.	—
Baptism with the Holy Ghost,	I.	V.	1.
Baptism with fire,	I.	V.	2.
Baptism with sufferings,	I.	V.	3.
Baptism without Divine authority,	I.	VI.	1, 2.
Modes of Baptism mentioned,	I.	VII.	1.
The point stated.	I.	VII.	2.
No Scriptural command for immersion,	II.	I.	1.
No example of immersion,	II.	I.	2.
No inference in favor of immersion,	II.	I.	3.
No allusion to immersion,	II.	I.	4.
Immersion not the only mode of Baptism,	II.	I.	5.
Immersion improbable,	II.	I.	6.
Immersion impossible,	II.	I.	7.
Assertions and questions,	II.	I.	8.
Lexicons and dictionaries on immersion,	II.	II.	1.
Writers relating to immersion,	II.	II.	2.
Denominations relating to immersion,	II.	II.	3.
Several matters touching immersion,	II.	II.	4.

	Book.	Part.	Chap.
Immersers turn aside from Scripture,	II.	III.	1.
They mistake the point,	II.	III.	2.
They mistake assertion for proof,	II.	III.	3.
When immersion did not originate,	II.	IV.	1.
When and where it did originate,	II.	IV.	2.
Evils of immersion,	II.	IV.	3.
General view of Immersion.	—	—	—
Sprinkling, Scriptural Baptism,	III.	I.	1.
Scriptural examples of sprinkling,	III.	I.	2.
Lexicons and dictionaries on sprinkling,	III.	II.	1.
Other writers on sprinkling,	III.	II.	2.
Denominations on sprinkling,	III.	II.	3.
General view of Sprinkling.	—	—	—
The church defined,	IV.	I.	1.
Invisible church includes spiritual Baptism,	IV.	I.	2.
Water Baptism included in visible church organization,	IV.	I.	3.
Not things, but persons are to be Baptized,	IV.	II.	1.
What in the subject is essential to Baptism,	IV.	II.	2.
Adults proper subjects of Baptism,	IV.	II.	3.
Infants proper subjects of Baptism,	IV.	II.	4.
Church members to be Baptized,	IV.	III.	1.
Scriptural evidence in favor of infant Baptism,	IV.	III.	2.
Scriptural examples of infant Baptism,	IV.	III.	3.
Early christians on infant Baptism,	IV.	IV.	1.
Modern christian writers on infant Baptism,	IV.	IV.	2.
Denominations on infant Baptism,	IV.	IV.	3.
What infants to be Baptized,	IV.	V.	1.
Advantages of infant Baptism,	IV.	V.	2.
Evils of neglecting infant Baptism,	IV.	V.	3.
Evils of rejecting infant Baptism,	IV.	V.	4.
General view of infant Baptism.	—	—	—
Conclusion.	—	—	—

BIBLE BAPTISM.

THE RULE.

That the Bible is the *only* RULE in all religious duties, is a grand mark of distinction between christians and others. To admit that any deviation from this rule, is a part of christianity, is to declare virtually, that the Bible is defective, and that men are wiser than God. If the Bible is a perfect rule, it cannot be made better by any additions or omissions which men may suggest. Deviations from its perfect requirements, cannot be holy; they must be sinful. Since the wisdom of God is revealed in his word; none can forsake this without admitting practically, that they prefer the wisdom of men to that of God. Those who take the Bible for their only rule in all religious duties, have perfect wisdom to direct them. Its teaching is plain, positive and uncompromising. It does not teach opposite and contradictory sentiments. In its declarations, we have more than the opinions of men; we have the authority of God. Those who take the scriptures of truth for their only rule in all religious duties,

1. Ascertain the exact meaning of its words.
2. They take the words in their literal signification, unless the context or parallel passages require them to be used figuratively.
3. In figurative expressions, they deviate as little as possible from the literal signification of the words.
4. What the scriptures teach, they take for positive proof on all religious subjects.
5. What the scriptures require, and that only, they receive and practise as parts of their religion.
6. What the scriptures forbid, they do not practise for any purpose; certainly not as a part of their religion.

On the subject of baptism, therefore, the scriptures only can be recognized as authority to which all are bound to submit.

RECOMMENDATION.

BIBLE BAPTISM is, by many competent judges, said to be the most valuable work written on the subject of which it treats. Moreover, it is the only one in print which discusses the subject of baptism in all its various parts.

Ministers and laymen in the Associate, the Associate Reformed, the Reformed Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed and Presbyterian churches, have expressed the above sentiment in relation to this work. They also affirm that it ought to be in the hands of every man, woman and child who can read the English language. But the publisher says; read the book. It will recommend itself.

DEDICATION.

To all who in reality take the word of God for their only rule in all religious duties, this work is affectionately DEDICATED by their servant in the gospel of Christ,

THE AUTHOR.

BIBLE BAPTISM.

BOOK FIRST—BAPTISM.

PART FIRST—BAPTISM WITH WATER.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM WITH WATER TAUGHT IN THE WORD OF GOD.

1. *The Scriptures definitely teach that baptism with water was required by Divine authority.* John the Baptist repeatedly declares, in the most positive language, that he baptized "with water." His language on this subject is; "I baptize with water;" I am "come baptizing with water;" He—"sent me to baptize with water;"* "I indeed baptize you with water."† That John, by Divine authority, used water in baptism, is as definitely taught by the language just quoted, as it is possible for words to teach any fact whatever. To deny therefore, that John baptized "with water," cannot be less than a positive denial of the plain declarations of God's word.

2. *The disciples of Christ baptized with water after His resurrection.* The language of Peter recorded by Divine inspiration, teaches this truth. It is this; "Can any man forbid water that" Cornelius and his friends "should not be baptized?"‡ The language of the Eunuch teaches the same fact; "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?"§ Both these statements, in relation to the use of water in baptism, were made some time after the resurrection of Christ; and in each of them the fact that the disciples used water in baptism, is most clearly taught.

3. *The commission to baptize shows that baptism with water was intended.* In this Christ says; "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them."‖ Here the disciples are required to administer baptism. They did baptize as they are

*John 1: 26. 31. 33. †Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke, 3: 16. ‡Acts 10: 47. §Acts 8: 36. ‖Mat. 28: 19.

here required to do. They administered the very ordinance included in this command. But as they did not, and could not baptize with the Holy Ghost, that being the work of a Divine person,* and as they did baptize as the commission directed; they must therefore have baptized with water. When the Apostles administered the baptism mentioned in their commission, it is manifest that they then baptized not with the Holy Spirit, but with water.

4. *Persons were commanded by the Apostles to be baptized with water.* Peter "commanded" Cornelius and his friends after "the Holy Ghost fell on them," "to be baptized"† by some person or persons authorized to administer the ordinance of baptism. As these persons had already been renewed by the power of the Spirit, and made new creatures, when Peter commanded them to be baptized, the command must have required them to be baptized with water. When Peter, with the eleven, on "the day of Pentecost," preached to the "men of Judea," and to all those who dwelt "at Jerusalem," and commanded them to "Repent and be baptized," and declared that they should "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,"‡ it is manifest that the baptism here mentioned is distinct from repentance, and from "the gift of the Holy Ghost." This baptism therefore must have been with water, not with the Spirit; because these are mentioned as really different from each other. Besides, Peter, with the eleven, would not command the Holy Ghost to baptize persons; and if the command were given to men and executed by them, then the baptism must have been with water, not with the Holy Ghost; for baptism with the Holy Ghost, is the work of a Divine person, not of men.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM WITH WATER TO CONTINUE TILL THE END OF TIME.

1. *There is no evidence that baptism with water is to be discontinued.* If the whole scriptures should be searched, not a single passage could be found that would teach either directly or indirectly, that baptism with water was to cease in any age of the New Testament church. But, since it

*Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16, Acts 1: 5. †Acts 10: 44. 48. ‡Acts 2: 1. 14. 38.

was administered by Divine authority (*a*); and since God has not, in any passage of scripture, directed men to discontinue the practice of baptizing with water, and since there is nothing in baptism itself to limit its duration, therefore to lay aside that ordinance, is a practical repeal, by men, of a Divine law. No man can do this without great guilt in the sight of God. Baptism with water must therefore be continued in the church of God, till he repeals his own law on this subject.

2. *The commission to baptize teaches that baptism with water is to continue till the end of time.* The commission to baptize includes the promise; "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."* In this promise, Christ engages to be with those whom he commissions to teach and baptize. The duration of the commission is also mentioned. It is to be in force till "the end of the world." But since the whole commission is to be in force till the end of time; therefore that part of it which requires the Apostles and their successors in office to be baptized with water (*b*), must remain as long in force. As the same commission requires Christ's ministering servants to teach and baptize with water; the duty to teach and baptize must continue together or cease at the same period. But teaching is to continue till the end of time; and therefore baptism with water, required in the same commission which requires ministers to teach, must also continue till the end of time.

3. *Inspired men teach that baptism with water is to continue till the end of time.* These baptized with water after the resurrection of Christ (*c*). This shows that they understood what their commission required them to do. They thus taught that they knew that baptism with water was an ordinance in the church, which did not cease to be binding at the death or resurrection of Christ. Nor, as inspired men, could they be mistaken in this matter. Thus baptism with water was, by the example of inspired men, handed down to the church; and by the church it has been practiced ever since the New Testament dispensation of it commenced, till the present day. Those who do and will

(*a*) Ch. 1, § 1–4. *Mat. 28: 20. (*b*) Ch. 1, § 3. (*c*) Ch. 1, § 2.

hereafter follow the same inspired instructions and examples, will baptize with water "even unto the end of the world."

4. *Baptism with water as a Divine institution, is to continue in the church till the end of time.* Our Saviour in his mediatorial character instituted the ordinance of christian baptism. He claims this character in the expression; "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."* In his human nature merely, he could not have received all this "power;" in his Divine nature merely he possessed it already; but in his human and Divine natures united in one person, he could and did receive "all power." In this character he gives the commission to teach and baptize. He says; "All power is given unto me—Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them."† Because he possessed all power, he directed them to teach and baptize. This commission therefore is of Divine authority. All it contains is therefore Divinely instituted. It requires baptism with water to continue till the end of time (*a*); and therefore whenever and wherever this ordinance is administered "according to Christ's appointment" and by his authority, the administration is in obedience to a Divine command; and therefore the ordinance thus administered is always a Divine institution.

PART SECOND.

BAPTISM ADMINISTERED BY DIVINE AUTHORITY BEFORE THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM UNTO MOSES.

1. *The Israelites were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."* This baptism was administered about 1491 years before the birth of Christ. About 50 years after his birth, we are informed that the Jews were all "under the cloud and all passed through the sea;" and that they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."‡ If God had not told us in his word, that the Israelites were baptized "in the cloud and in the sea," we would not have even conjectured that the cloud passing over them and pour-

*Mat. 28: 18. †Mat. 28: 18. 19. (*a*) § 2. ‡1 Cor. 10: 1. 2.

ing "out water"* upon them, was baptism; or that they, passing through the sea on "dry ground," were baptized. But this *was* baptism; and this account in Exodus† is the most ancient record existing that mentions baptism. In this baptism, no human hand administered the ordinance. But God himself baptized the nation of Israel; while they received the ordinance of baptism which the Divine hand administered. The sea was his baptismal font which contained the element of water to be used in baptizing his people. He used the cloud, as it passed from their front to their rear, in baptizing them, before they entered the opening from which the sea "fled"‡ before omnipotent power. After they entered upon "the dry land in the midst of the sea,"§ the waters of the deep did not close in upon them. The Almighty's hand restrained them from doing this; while he baptized them with the waters of the sea.

2. *This baptism was typical.* We are informed that a number of things among which this baptism "unto Moses," is mentioned, "were our examples;" and "happened unto them for ensamples."‖ These things therefore were intended to symbolize certain occurrences in New Testament times. Baptism unto Moses is especially mentioned as one of these. It was therefore a typical or symbolical baptism. It may have typified christian baptism.

3. *This baptism was expressive of the union of the Israelites to Moses as their leader.* They were "baptized unto" (Greek εις *to*, *in* or *into*) him.¶ This expression indicates, not that they were all entirely covered over in the body of Moses; but that they were thus united to him as their leader and law-giver, under God their king. By receiving this baptism, they publicly recognised this as their relation to Moses. God, by administering this baptism to them, gave his solemn sanction to this their union. Therefore this relation to Moses as their leader was, not only expressed by this baptism, but it also in this ordinance received the Divine approbation.

4. *In this baptism, their obedience to Moses was indicated.* Obedience to the person or being, in, unto, to or into whom or in whose name, the ordinance is administered, is always

*Ps. 77: 17. †Ex. 14: 19-22. ‡Ps. 114: 3. §Ex. 14: 29. ‖1 Cor. 10: 6. 11. ¶1 Cor. 10: 2 in Greek.

recognized as due from the baptized. He who administers baptism or requires others to do so, demands obedience from those to whom it is administered. This obedience is to be rendered, to him in whose name or unto whom they are baptized. When God requires this obedience; the baptized are always bound to render it; because the requirement is then always just; and obedience therefore always proper. Hence, when the Israelites were baptized *to*, *in*, *unto* or *into* Moses; they were under baptismal obligations to render him personal and prompt obedience.

CHAPTER II.

DIVERS BAPTISMS.

1. *These baptisms were Old Testament washings.* The "gifts and sacrifices" in Old Testament times, it is said, "stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings" (βαπτισμοις) or baptisms, "and carnal ordinances."* In the Greek, these "divers washings" are expressly called baptisms. They are also mentioned as belonging exclusively to the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant, and including all its ceremonial washings.† Of these washings or baptisms, three specimens are definitely named.‡ Two of these are with blood and one with water. These are all mentioned as ceremonial purifications.§ With one or both these fluids, the "unclean,"—"the book and all the people,"—"the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry,"‖ were ceremonially purified. The various ceremonial washings therefore belonging to the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant, are, by the Holy Spirit, called "Divers baptisms."¶ In this expression they are all included.

2. *These "Divers baptisms" were numerous.* If any ceremonial washings existed among the Israelites before the days of Moses, they are not definitely mentioned in the word of God; nor are any kind of washings before this, called baptisms. But from the time the passover was instituted, 1491 years before Christ, till he suffered on the cross; these

*Heb. 9: 9. 10 in Greek. †See Heb 9: 1-23. ‡Heb. 9: 13. 19. 21. §Heb. 9: 13. 22. ‖Heb. 9: 13. 19. 21, Ex. 21: 6. 8, Lev. 14: 4-7 and 16: 15. 16. 19, Num. 19: 2-5. ¶See Heb. 9: 10 in Greek.

washings which the Holy Ghost calls "baptisms"* were so numerous that under "the law almost all things," were "purged with blood,"† and some with water. To produce ceremonial purification, blood was applied to "the altar,"—to "the people,"—to "the tabernacle,"—to "the vessels of the ministry;"‡ and for the same purpose it was frequently applied to other things. Water also was used in cleansing the "leper,"—the Israelites' "clothes,"—"Aaron and his sons,"—the other "Levites,"§ and in several other instances. It is manifest therefore that these "divers washings" or baptisms among the Israelites, were very numerous.

3. *Certain vessels under special circumstances were to be cleansed by these washings or baptisms.* If "the pot" in which the "sin-offering" was "sodden," was made of brass, it was to be thus ceremonially purified with "water." Vessels for ordinary use, into which any "unclean" reptile might fall, or those "of wood" touched by a person who had an "issue," were also to be cleansed ceremonially with "water."‖ For these, and the various other ceremonial washings or baptisms mentioned with Divine approbation in the Old Testament, the Israelites had the positive command of God. It ought also to be continually borne in mind that all these washings are, by the Holy Spirit, denominated baptisms *(a)*.

PART THIRD.

BAPTISM ADMINISTERED BY DIVINE AUTHORITY DURING CHRIST'S MINISTRY ON EARTH.

CHAPTER I.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

1. *John the Baptist was a truly great man.* Before he was born, the angel who foretold his birth, declared of him; "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord."¶ That he was all that "Gabriel" said he would be, will be manifest to any person who will examine what God, in His word, says of him. John was, (1.) *by birth a Jewish Priest.* He was the

*See Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. †Heb. 9: 22. ‡Ex. 24: 6. 8, Heb. 9: 21. §Lev. 14: 8, Ex. 19: 10, and 40: 12, Num. 8: 6. 7. ‖Lev. 6: 25. 28. and 11: 29. 32. and 15: 12. (a) § 1. ¶Luke 1: 15.

son of Zacharias, a priest "of the course of Abia."* And because he was a priest's son, he was by the Levitical law, "consecrated to minister" to God "in the priest's office."† (2.) *He was Elias or Elijah (a),* not in person, but in spirit and in power. When the Jews said to him; "Art thou Elias?" meaning Elias or Elijah in person; "he saith, I am not. The angel speaking of him before his birth, said; "He shall go before" the Lord "in the spirit and power of Elias." Our Saviour says of John the Baptist; "This is Elias which was for to come;" that is, this is he who was "to come" in the spirit and power of Elias, according to the prediction of the prophet.‡ (3.) *He was the harbinger or forerunner of Christ.* God says; "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." This is, by our Saviour, applied to John as being "written" of him. He was also, in his very infancy, addressed in this language; "And thou, child, shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his way."§ (4.) "*He was a burning and a shining light.*" He is so called by his Great Master; because, both by precept and example, he clearly reflected the bright beams of "the Sun of righteousness."‖ (5.) *He was a "voice."*¶ As such he directed the attention of the Jews to himself, and *from* himself to the Lord Jesus Christ. (6.) *He was "a prophet,"*—"the prophet of the Highest." In this character, he predicted that Christ would very soon appear in public as the Messiah so often foretold by other prophets.** (7.) *He was "more than a prophet."* He was a prophet; a priest; a light; a voice; the forerunner of Christ, &c. To be all this, is to be "much more than a prophet."†† (8.) *He was inferior to none who lived before him.* On this point Jesus Christ declares; "Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."‡‡ (9.) *He was a martyr.* For his faithfulness in reproving Herod for his sins, he was first "cast into prison" and then "beheaded."§§ He was the last, in all probability, who suffered death for his religion, before the Great

*Luke 1: 5. 62. 63. and 3: 2. †Ex. 28: 41. and 29: 1–37, Num. 3: 3, Deut. 18. 5. (a) The Hebrew name Elijah, when expressed in Greek, is Elias. ‡John1: 21, Luke 1: 17. 76, Mat. 11: 14. and 17: 10. 12. 13, Mal 4: 5. §Mal 3: 1, Mat. 11: 10. ‖John 5: 35, Mal. 4: 2. ¶Isa. 40: 3, Luke 3: 4, John 1. 23. **Mat. 11: 7. 9. and 21: 26, Luke 1: 76. See John 1: 26–33. ††Mat 11: 9, Luke 7: 26. ‡‡Mat. 11: 11, Luke 7: 28. §§Mat. 11: 2 and 14: 3–12, Mark 6: 14–29, Luke 3: 19, 20.

Sacrifice was offered on the cross. (10.) *The "least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he.."** John was, in no degree, inferior to any prophet, priest or king who lived before him. Nevertheless, he who breaks one of the least of God's "commandments," and teaches "men" to do "so"—and is therefore properly "called the least in the kingdom of Heaven,"† is greater in point of privileges than he was. It appears therefore that a New Testament christian, whose spiritual knowledge and graces are inferior to those of many around him, enjoys, notwithstanding, greater privileges than even John the Baptist did. Certainly then, the most "humble" and obedient,† who are "the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven,"‡ since they are exempt from the ceremonial law, and enjoy the written revelation contained in the New Testament, as well as that of the Old, together with an all-sufficient atoning sacrifice already made, must enjoy greater privileges than John.

2. *John the Baptist lived and died under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant.* This is undeniably certain from a number of facts stated in the word of God. (1.) *Old Testament ordinances continued in force till the death of Christ.* These were circumcision and the passover. Being ordinances peculiar to the Old Testament, they could remain in force only during that dispensation. Of the last passover, Christ, just before his crucifixion, says to his disciples; "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God:"—and "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come."§ This language clearly indicates that "the kingdom of God" here mentioned, had not come, or commenced, when this was spoken; nor that the typical passover of the Old Testament was at that time fulfilled in "Christ our passover," who was not then yet sacrificed for us."‖ But in the death of Christ, its whole design was completed. It was then swallowed up in the great Antitype. All the typical prophecies included in the passover, were completely fulfilled at the death of Christ, our paschal "Lamb slain," in the purpose of God, "from the foundation of the

*Mat. 11: 11, Luke 7: 28. †Mat. 5: 19. ‡Mat. 18: 4. §Luke 22: 15. 16. 18. ‖1 Cor. 5: 7.

world."* As Christ eat the passover which was an Old Testament ordinance, a very short time before he suffered on the cross; so whatever took place before his death must have been under that dispensation, of which the passover was an ordinance or a part. John the Baptist was "beheaded"† before Christ eat the last passover; therefore he lived and died under the Old Testament dispensation, while the paschal ordinance was legally in force. (2.) *John, in his preaching, taught definitely that the New Testament dispensation of the covenant had not then commenced.* That which is "at hand," is near; within reach; but is not yet in possession. "The kingdom of Heaven" or "of God," may denote the Old Testament church; the New Testament church; the whole church on earth in every age; or the kingdom of glory. Which it denotes must be determined by the connection in which the expression is used. When John began to preach, he declared; "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand."‡ Every kingdom has a king, together with subjects and territory to be governed. Over "the kingdom of God" or "of Heaven," God is king. His professed friends are his subjects. Wherever they reside, in any part of the universe, is the region governed by him as his special kingdom. As in the days of John, the Old Testament church had long existed, that could not then be said to be "at hand," or near; nor could this expression be used of the kingdom of glory; because that was "at hand," or near, just before his death, to every saint who had entered it, in any preceding age. It is perfectly evident then from the words "at hand," used in relation to "the kingdom" mentioned by John, that the New Testament dispensation of the covenant was intended. *That* and *that only*, could be "at hand," as "the kingdom of Heaven," when John began to preach. (3.) *Jesus Christ preached the same truth soon after his baptism.* When he began to preach, he said; "the kingdom of Heaven is at hand."§ It was near, but had not then commenced, as appears from the language of Christ. (4.) *Christ teaches his disciples to preach the same truth.* At or near the close of John's public ministry, and but a short time before he was imprisoned, and not long before his death; Jesus Christ, in

*Rev. 13: 8. †Mat. 14: 1–11. Mark 6: 14–30. Luke 9: 7–9. ‡Mat. 3: 2. §Mat. 4: 17. Mark 1: 15.

sending out the twelve Apostles to preach "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," directs them to say to the Jews; "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand;"—"the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you."* (5.) *He taught the same truth to the Jews.* Some time after John's death and not long before his own crucifixion, Jesus Christ told the Jews when they saw certain signs, which were future when he spoke; they might then "know that the kingdom of God" was "nigh at hand"† or very near. (6.) *Christ himself, during his lifetime on earth, "was a minister of the circumcision."*‡ He, while on earth, confined his public ministrations almost entirely to the Jews. "He came unto his own" in a special manner. In relation to this fact, he says; "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."§ The Old Testament dispensation of the covenant with the ceremonies of the ceremonial law, terminated with the Redeemer's last expiring breath, when he exclaimed; "It is finished."‖ Since therefore "the kingdom of Heaven" or New Testament church, was only "at hand" or near, but was not commenced, when John began his ministry; when Christ began to preach; about the time John was imprisoned, and was only "nigh at hand" or very near, more than a year and a half after John's death and just before the crucifixion of Christ; it is absolutely certain that John lived and died before the New Testament dispensation of the covenant commenced; and that therefore he belonged to that of the Old, which ended as Christ expired on the cross.

3. *John Baptized.* This appears, (1.) from his title. He is called the Baptist, because he baptized.¶ (2.) He himself declares that he baptized. He repeatedly says; "I baptize with water."** (3.) John the Evangelist, with other sacred writers, teaches that he baptized "in Bethabara"—"in Enon," &c.†† (4.) "The baptism of John" is often mentioned in scripture, as a fact universally known and admitted.‡‡ From evidence such as this, none who believe the scriptures to be the word of God, can hesitate to admit that John baptized.

4. *John's authority to baptize was Divine.* That this was

*Mat. 10: 6, 7, Luke 10: 9, 11. †Luke 21: 31. ‡Rom. 15: 8. §Mat. 15: 24, John 1: 11. ‖John 19: 30, Col. 2: 14. ¶Mat. 3: 1, and 11: 11, 12. **Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16, John 1: 26. ††John 1. 28, and 3: 23. ‡‡See Mat. 21: 25, Mark 11: 30, Acts 1: 22.

the case, is proved, (1.) from the general evidence given in the account of his life and character contained in the holy scriptures.* (2.) It is also expressly declared that he was "sent from God,"—"sent to baptize"—and that "the word of God came unto John."† This language shows clearly that his commission to baptize was Divine. (3.) Jesus Christ informs us that John's authority to baptize, was "from Heaven" or Divine. This he does in the question; "The baptism of John, whence was it? from Heaven or of men?"‡ This interrogatory affirmation is equivalent to a positive declaration that John's baptism was "from Heaven;" or that he baptized by Divine authority. His commission to baptize was therefore "from God."

5. *God the Father, as his personal act, commissioned John to baptize.* This fact John himself teaches. He declares; "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."§ This account which John gives of his commission, shows clearly that his authority to baptize was not derived from the Son or Spirit as the personal act of either; and that therefore, since this his authority was Divine(*a*), it must have been obtained from the Father, as his personal act.

6. *John's commission to baptize did not include succession.* He had no right to transfer to others his authority to baptize. The commission which includes succession, not only permits, but absolutely requires this. In his commission, it is stated that John was "sent from God;" that he was "sent to baptize;" but not the least intimation is given in any portion of the word of God, that John was required, authorized or permitted, to send or commission others to baptize; or that at any time he did or attempted to do so.

7. *John was to "decrease."* Speaking of himself, he declares; "I must decrease."‖ (1.) He was to decrease in *influence*, as the moon's influence decreases when the sun rises. (2.) *He was to decrease in usefulness*, as the bright rays of the sun renders the pale moon-beams of little or no value; or as the harbinger's work is done when his lord

*See Mat. 3: 1–14, Mark 1: 1–9, Luke 1: 13–20 57–80, and 3: 1–21. †Jonn 1: 6. 33. Luke 3: 2. ‡Mat. 21: 25, Mark 11: 30. §John 1: 33. (*a*) § 4. ‖John 3: 30.

whom he announced, has appeared. (3.) *The number of his disciples* was to decrease. His public ministry was soon ended; and then he could baptize, in person, no more disciples. He had no authority to empower others to baptize *(a)*; and therefore the disciples whom he baptized must soon pass into the eternal world and leave no others to occupy their place. (4.) *His office of forerunner of Christ* was to decrease *in importance* as the Messiah became more and more manifest to Israel; till at last it would entirely cease when all its duties were completely discharged; that is, when Christ was fully and clearly pointed out to the Jews. John was to *decrease*. It cannot be, therefore, that every person who is baptized *increases* by one, the number of his followers, or "disciples;" as those whom he baptized are called.

8. *John's commission to baptize was special in its design.* An important part of this design was to make the Lord Jesus Christ "manifest to Israel." He himself declares this in express language. He says; "That he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water."* When he began to baptize, he did not know Christ personally. He declares on this subject; "I knew him not;" that is, he had no personal knowledge of him, as man, when he used this expression. He was to acquire this knowledge by immediate revelation, and then communicate it to those who came to his baptism. This special knowledge of Christ, he received when the Spirit "descended" upon him "in a bodily shape like a dove."† He then could, and did point Christ out to the Jews as the Messiah of the prophets. He then directed them to "Behold the Lamb of God."‡ Another part of the design of his commission to baptize, was to require the Jews as a body, to repent, and to "bring forth—fruits meet for repentance." He was thus "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord,"§ so that they might thankfully receive the "Prince of life," the messenger of mercy sent from above, when he openly appeared among them. John therefore was commissioned to baptize, in order, (1.) To lead the Jews to repentance and holiness of life; and thus to prepare them to receive Christ their Messiah at his public appearance

(a) § 6. *John 1: 31, 33. †Luke 3: 22. ‡John 1: 29. §Luke 1: 17, Mat. 3: 2, 8, Mark 1: 2-4, Luke 1: 17, and 3: 8,

among them; (2.) To point him out as the Messiah to such as received his baptism(*a*).

9. *John's baptism was intended for the Jews only.* This we learn, (1.) by knowing the situation of the places where he baptized. He baptized "in Bethabara beyond Jordan;" "in Enon;" at "Jordan;" and "in the wilderness."* These places were all in the land of Palestine, the country inhabited by the Jews. (2.) The Jews and they only are mentioned as receiving his baptism. "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan"† went out to him to be baptized. These were all Jews; and there is no evidence that he baptized or was authorized to baptize a single Gentile. That John baptized Jews is certain. There is no evidence that he baptized any others. To affirm that he did, without authority from the word of God, is a deviation from the scriptural rule(*b*). But as it must be admitted that he baptized those for whom his baptism was intended, and as he baptized Jews only, therefore his baptism was intended for them and for no others.

10. *John's baptism was peculiar to himself.* It was administered by him and by no other person. This appears, (1.) from the fact that, *by his commission*, he, and no other person, was authorized to baptize(*c*). His baptism, without Divine authority, would have been mere mockery. Hence we are informed that God sent him to baptize; (*d*) so that he was empowered to administer this baptism. But no person before or after him, had or has Divine authority to administer the same baptismal rite that John administered; therefore his baptism was peculiar to himself. (2.) The name by which it is called, proves this fact. It is often denominated "John's baptism" and "the baptism of John;"‡ but it is not specified in scripture by any other distinguishing appellation. Since therefore it is properly called "John's baptism" or "the baptism of John," and is not known in the word of God by any other name; his baptism must have been peculiar to himself. (3.) His *title* proves that his baptism was peculiar to himself. He is entitled "the Baptist."§

(*a*) On Zech. 9: 6, a Jewish Rabbi says, Elias will come to distinguish and purify the unclean. *John 1: 28, and 3: 23, Mat. 3: 6, Mark 1: 4. †Mat. 3: 5, Mark 1: 5, Luke 3: 7. 8. (*b*) See Rule No. 5. (*c*) § 6. (*d*) § 5. ‡Mat. 21: 25, Mark 11: 30, Luke 7: 29, Acts 1: 22, and 18: 25, and 19: 3. §Mat. 3: 1, and 11: 11, 12, and 14: 2. 8, Mark 6: 14. 24. 25, Luke 9: 19.

John, and no other person named in the whole word of God, is called the "Baptist." Though many others baptized, yet no other one received this title. Since therefore he only of all that baptized in scripture times, was called "the Baptist;" therefore his baptism, from the administration of which he was entitled "the Baptist," must have been peculiar to himself. If it were not so, others who baptized as well as John, would also, in the word of God, have been called Baptists. Had not the baptism of others been essentially distinct from that of John, they would have deserved and received the same title that John did. (4.) Of those whom he baptized he chose some as his immediate followers. These are often called "his disciples."* They were called "John's disciples;" because he baptized them, and then received them under his immediate care as their instructor. They would not have been called "his disciples," any more than the disciples of any other man, had not his baptism been peculiar to himself. It appears therefore from John's commission, it being confined to himself; from the fact that his baptism is called by his own name; from his title; and from the distinctive appellation given to his immediate followers whom he baptized; that his baptism was of a special kind, peculiar to himself.

11. *John did not baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."*† In the administration of christian baptism, this form is indispensable. But in John's baptism it was not used. This is manifest from the fact that some who had been baptized unto "John's baptism"—"had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."‡ If John had baptized in the name of the Triune God or used the form prescribed by our Saviour; those whom he baptized, would certainly have heard of the "Holy Ghost;" because in that case this name, as well as that of the Father and Son, would have been mentioned at their baptism.

12. *Persons whom John baptized were re-baptized by Apostolic authority.* When those who had received John's baptism without hearing of the "Holy Ghost," were instructed by Paul, they were baptized in the name of the "Lord Je-

*Mat. 9: 14, and 11: 2, and 14: 12, Mark 6: 29, John 1: 35, and 3: 25. †Mat. 28: 19. ‡Acts 19: 2, 3.

sus,"* not *excluding* but *including* the Father and Spirit; as is manifest from the passage here quoted, taken in connection with the commission by which Christ authorized his disciples to baptize. This commission expressly required them to baptize in the name of "the Father" and Spirit as well as "of the Son."† None are allowed by the word of God to re-baptize those who had received christian baptism; but those whom John baptized were re-baptized, therefore John's could not have been that baptism which none are authorized to repeat.

Of the "three thousand" baptized "at Jerusalem" on "the day of Pentecost,"‡ it is more than probable that a portion had heard John preach and had been baptized by him. It would have been scarcely possible to find three thousand persons, at Jerusalem, in a promiscuous assembly, in less than seven years, perhaps less than four from the time John began to preach and baptize, not one of whom had formed a portion of "the multitude" composed of "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan,"§ who were baptized by John. It is highly probable therefore that not a few of those three thousand who were baptized on "the day of Pentecost," had before received John's baptism. If this was the case, the evidence that John's disciples were re-baptized would be repeated,—but scarcely strengthened; as no language can be more positive and pointed than that already quoted on this subject.

13. *John's baptism was not the seal of the covenant into which God entered with his visible church.* As he lived and died under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant *(a)*, during which circumcision and the passover, not baptism and the Lord's supper, sealed its promises and confirmed other blessings; so *his* baptism could not have been its seal. Circumcision then sealed the covenant, and was the mark by which a person's standing in the visible "congregation of the Lord,"‖ was at that time known. John was therefore circumcised, and so was the Lord Jesus Christ who was born six months after him.¶ His baptism could not therefore have been the seal of God's covenant entered into with his visible people; for that seal then was circumcision.

*Acts 19: 5. †See Mat. 28: 19. ‡Acts 2: 1. 5. §Mat. 3: 5, Mark 1: 5, Luke 3: 3. 7. *(a)* § 2. ‖Num. 27: 17. ¶See Luke 1: 24. 26. 27. 59, and 2: 21.

14. *The law and the prophets did not end when John appeared.* (1.) The moral law did not cease to be binding at the birth, public appearance, imprisonment or death of John. *That law* is of perpetual obligation as a rule of life; because, "through faith"—"the law" is not made "void," but established.* (2.) The ceremonial law continued to be binding till, at the death of Christ, it was nailed "to His cross;"† and but just before this, our Saviour in eating the passover, observed a part of the ceremonial law. It was therefore, when he eat the last passover, yet in force *(a)*. (3.) Not a few prophets, besides the Apostles and Evangelists lived after the death of John; after the death of Christ. Of these, "Agabus" and "Barnabas" and "Simeon" and "Lucius" and "Manaen" and "Judas" and "Silas,"‡ may be named. The law therefore, when John appeared, did not lay aside its binding force; nor did God then cease to send forth men to prophesy in his name. And, although the Old Testament scriptures, (often called "the law and the prophets,) were, until John" appeared,§ the only Divine revelation which God had then given to man; yet, it by no means follows that they should at that time, as a matter of course, cease to be observed, or that no other prophets should appear after those mentioned in the Old Testament. Moreover, "the law and the prophets were, until John" came "in the spirit and power of Elias,"‖ continually pointing the Jewish nation to him as the harbinger of "the Prince of peace."¶ Besides, "All the prophets and the law prophesied until John,"** of him, as a great prophet. He was to be the last prophet under the legal or Old Testament dispensation; the "Elijah" who was to appear "*before* the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord;"†† the *one* who was to be the forerunner of the Messiah, and point him out as "the Lamb of God"‡‡ to guilty Israel. From these remarks, it is evident, that when John appeared, "the law and the prophets" did not cease to exist; did not lay aside their binding force; nor were the ceremonies of the ceremonial law yet fulfilled in the death of Christ.

15. *The New Testament dispensation did not commence during John's ministry.* Ceremonies peculiar to Old Testa-

*Rom. 3: 31. †Col. 2: 14. *(a)* § 2. ‡Acts 11: 27. 28, and 13: 1, and 15: 32. §Luke 16: 16. ‖Luke 1: 17. ¶Isa. 9: 6. **Mat. 11: 13. ††Mal. 4: 5. ‡‡John 1: 29.

ment times cannot be properly practiced in the New Testament church as religious duties. To do this would confound the legal and gospel dispensations of the covenant. It would bring christians under "the yoke of" ceremonial "bondage," and would be only to "tempt God,"* not to serve Him. John, "on the eighth day" after his birth, received circumcision, the Old Testament "seal of the righteousness of—faith."† At the time of his circumcision therefore, the Old Testament dispensation yet existed and was in force. Six months after John's circumcision, it still continued; for then Christ was circumcised*(a)*. He had been born in "the fulness of time."‡ When the time fixed for his birth in the Divine purpose and predicted by the prophets, had fully come, then he was born; and on the eighth day was circumcised. After John's death, our Saviour eat the passover*(b)*, an Old Testament ordinance. As therefore circumcision and the passover which, as religious ordinances, were peculiar to the Old Testament, were in force till after John's death; the New Testament dispensation, the sealing ordinances of which are not circumcision and the passover, could not have commenced during or before his public ministry. Besides, John lived and died under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant*(c)* and therefore before the New commenced; for none will maintain that a person can live and die under the Old Testament dispensation and yet live under the New; for a person cannot live under a dispensation which does not commence till after his death.

When Paul, about nineteen years after the death of Christ, "took and circumcised" Timothy, it was "because of the Jews,"§ not because circumcision was then a religious duty; for then "circumcision" was "nothing;"‖ though formerly it had been the external "seal" or "token of the covenant"¶ entered into between God and his visible people. Nor is it intimated that the circumcision of Timothy was intended as a religious rite, but merely as an act which, at that time, was in itself completely indifferent. It cannot therefore be adduced as a proof that in New Testament times, circumcision may or must be practiced as a religious rite.

During John's ministry the New Testament dispensation

*Acts 15: 10, Gal. 5: 1. †Luke 1: 59, Rom. 4: 11. *(a)* § 13. ‡Gal. 4: 4. *(b)* § 2. *(c)* §2, par. 1-9. §Acts 16: 1-3. ‖1 Cor. 7: 19. ¶Gen. 17: 11, Rom. 4: 11.

did not commence; because (1.) circumcision, as a religious duty, was practiced during his life; (2.) the passover was, after his death, observed as an Old Testament ordinance; (3.) he lived and died under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant.

16. *The New Testament dispensation did not commence till all the types had been fulfilled in the Antitype.* In the Old Testament, many types are mentioned. Some of these have special reference to the death of Christ for their fulfillment. The whole paschal sacrifice was typical of Christ who, as "our passover," was "sacrificed for us" on the cross.* The fact that "a bone of" the pascal lamb was not to "be broken," was a typical prophecy,† which was fulfilled when a bone of Christ was not broken on the cross. These Old Testament types, refering specially to the death of Christ, couid not have their complete fulfillment in any event before or after his crucifixion. In that event, and in that only, could these types meet in the Great Antitype. Before this event therefore, the Old Testament dispensation of which these types were a part, did not and could not end, nor the New commence.

The expression, "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God,"‡ does not signify that when John appeared, then the gospel first began to be preached; for about nineteen hundred years before this, "the gospel" was preached "unto Abraham."§ It was also "preached to the Israelites in the wilderness.‖ Moreover "the gospel of Jesus Christ" was preached when, in the first promise, it was said, the seed of the woman, the Redeemer of sinners, "shall bruise" the serpent's "head."¶ The gospel therefore instead of being first preached when John began his public ministry, had been preached four thousand years before he was born. Nor does the language used in this passage teach, that when John appeared, the gospel was first preached; or that it was not preached before; or that then the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant ended; or that the New or Gospel dispensation, then commenced. But the expression may denote, (1.) that "the beginning" or first cause "of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," being

*1 Cor. 5: 7. †Ex. 12: 46, Num. 9: 12, Ps. 34: 20, John 19: 36. ‡Mark 1: 1. §Gal. 3: 8. ‖Heb. 3: 8-11, and 4: 2. ¶Gen. 3: 15.

preached in any age, was to be sought in his Divine love and mercy revealed by "the prophets;" or, (2.) that its "beginning" or commencement was "as it is written in the prophets,"* that is, it was just as the prophets had described it in their day; or, (3.) that John who had not before preached as the harbinger of Christ, was now about to begin to proclaim "the gospel;" or, (4.) that "the gospel" of Christ had a "beginning" or commencement mentioned by "the prophets;" or, (5.) that the sacred writer was about to begin his account with that portion "of the gospel" which was fulfilled in John's preaching; or, (6.) that what he was about to write was to commence at "the beginning" of the history of the public ministry "of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." This, from the connection, appears to be the impression which the Holy Spirit intended, by the expression, to leave on the mind of the reader. It may also denote that the most essential part "of the gospel of Jesus Christ," is that portion which treats of him as "the Son of God;" for the original word (ἀρχη) translated "the beginning," may signify the principal or most essential part, as well as the commencement of an event. Indeed, the commencement is, in some respects, the most important part of any event. It is certain however, from the passages already quoted, that the expression, "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ," does not teach that the gospel was not preached till after John commenced his public ministry.

17. *John did not sustain the office of a minister of the New Testament church.* This appears, (1.) From the fact that John was beheaded before the office of the New Testament ministry was instituted. It was not till after the resurrection of our Saviour, that he said to "the eleven disciples" and to their successors in the ministerial office; "Go ye—and teach all nations."† John was not one of "the eleven;" nor was he one of their successors; for he was "beheaded"‡ more than a year and a half before Christ rose from the dead. As John died before the office of the christian ministry was instituted; so he could not have sustained that office. (2.) John was an Old Testament priest, and died under that dispensation *(a)*; therefore his was not the office of a New Testament minister. (3.) John's commission did

*Mark 1: 2. †Mat. 28: 2. 6. 13, 16. 19. ‡Mat. 14: 10-13. *(a)* § 1, 2.

not include succession *(a)*; it could not therefore be that of a New Testament minister, which does include succession. (4.) It was confined to the Jews *(b)*; and hence it was not the New Testament ministerial commission which extends to the Gentiles. (5.) His baptism was not administered in the name of the Trinity; and (6.) The subjects of it were re-baptized *(c)*; his commission to baptize could not therefore have been that of a minister of the New Testament dispensation of the church. It is manifest then that John's office was not that of a New Testament minister, by which those sustaining it, are authorized to "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."*

18. *John's baptism was not the christian sacrament called baptism.* To the very existence of the ordinance of christian baptism, several things are indispensably necessary. (1.) He who administers it, must live at least a part of his life, during the christian dispensation; because a man cannot administer any ordinance after his death. John died before the christian dispensation commenced, and while that of the Old Testament continued *(d)*. The baptism therefore which he administered could not be the christian sacrament of baptism; because he lived no part of his life during the christian dispensation. (2.) Christian baptism was not instituted till after John's death. Like the office of the christian ministry, it was instituted after Christ's resurrection. And as John's death preceded that of the Saviour *(e)*, it must have preceded the institution of the christian ordinance of baptism; because this last did not precede but followed the death of Christ. John could not then administer an ordinance which was not instituted till some time after his death. (3.) He did not baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" *(f)*. In this name, and in this only, can christian baptism be administered;† therefore, John's, since it was not administered in this name, could not have been christian baptism. (4.) John's baptism was repeated by apostolic authority *(g)*, therefore, John's was not christian baptism; for this is not to be repeated. (5.) It was not the Son but the Father by whom John was sent to baptize *(h)*; his, therefore, was not christian baptism. (6.)

(a) § 6, P. iv. Ch. 1, § 5. *(b)* § 9, P. iv. Ch. 1, § 7. *(c)* § 11. 12, P. iv. Ch. 1, § 17. *Mark 16: 15. *(d)* § 2. *(e)* § 2. 15. *(f)* § 11. †See Mat. 28: 19. *(g)* § 12. *(h)* § 5.

John's, instead of being the ordinance of christian baptism, had very little in common with that sacrament (*a*). It is perfectly manifest then, that his was not christian baptism. Whatever it is supposed to be; whether it is considered as one of the "divers washings" or baptisms* of the Jews; or as an ordinance peculiar to himself as the harbinger of Christ, in the morning-twilight of the gospel or New Testament day, just as the darkness of the ancient dispensation was beginning to break away; one thing is certain; his was not the christian sacrament of baptism.

CHAPTER II.

THE BAPTISM ADMINISTERED TO JESUS CHRIST.

1. *The standing of Jesus Christ in the covenant, was recognized by circumcision, not by baptism.* This we may learn, (1.) From the fact that circumcision was the "seal of the righteous of—faith,"†—the "token of the covenant,"‡ when he was "eight days" old.§ He was then circumcised. By thus receiving this seal of the covenant, he was publicly recognised and registered as a visible member of "The congregation of the Lord," as one of Jehovah's professed "people"—"Israel."‖ (2.) The Jews are called "His own" people;¶ because, among other reasons, he was a circumcised descendant of Abram. He was therefore in his human nature a member of the Jewish nation. By birth he was a Jew.** His standing therefore in the covenant made with Abram, must, like that of other Jews, during that dispensation, have been recognized by circumcision. (3.) Jesus Christ is expressly called "A minister of the circumcision."†† Being circumcised and being a minister of the circumcision, both intimate that his standing in the covenant made with Abram was recognized by circumcision. (4.) He eat the passover several times during his life; and also just before his death.‡‡ By this, it is clearly taught that the Old Testament ordinances remained in full force till his death; and therefore circumcision did not, before that event, cease to be

(*a*) § 2–17. *Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. †Rom. 4: 11. ‡Gen. 17: 11. §Luke 2: 21. ‖Num. 27: 17, Ps. 114: 15, and 148: 14, Isa. 63: 8, Mat. 1: 1-16, Luke 3: 23-38. ¶John 1: 11. **See Rom. 9: 3–5. ††Rom. 15: 8. ‡‡See Luke 2: 40–47, John 2: 13. 23, and 5: 1, and 6: 4, and 11: 55. 56, Mat. 26: 2–5.

the seal or "token of the covenant." (5.) His covenant relation to the visible people of God, was recognized by circumcision, on the eighth day after his birth; and he was not baptized till he was "about thirty years of age."* Hence his standing in the visible kingdom of God on earth, must have been acknowledged by his circumcision; unless he remained, for thirty years, externally on the side of Satan; and none but the most desperately wicked would venture to think such a blasphemous thought, much less to clothe it in words.

2. *Jesus Christ was baptized by John.* This fact is several times recorded by the inspired writers. "Jesus" came from Galilee—"unto John, to be baptized of him;" and "He was baptized;"—"Jesus—was baptized of John;"—"Jesus also" was "baptized."† This language needs no comment. It is plain and definite. That John baptized the Lord Jesus Christ with water, is here taught in positive language. The fact is so undeniable that no one who believes the word of God can doubt its truth.

3. *Jesus Christ did not receive John's baptism in the same sense that others did.* John's was to the Jews, "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." They were baptized "unto repentance," confessed "their sins," and were required to "bring forth fruits meet for repentance."‡ In the very act of receiving his baptism, they publicly professed all this. Those therefore whom John baptized, (except our Saviour,) professed, by receiving his baptism, to repent of their sins, confessed them and were to prove the sincerity of their repentance in those appropriate "fruits," by bringing forth which, they corrected the evils of which they had been guilty. Since Jesus Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled," and "separate from sinners;" and since he "did no sin;"§ he had no sins to repent of and confess, to forsake and correct. His baptism therefore could not have been "unto repentance for the remission of sins," as was that of other Jews. He did not then receive John's baptism in the same sense that others did. When therefore John baptized Christ, and when he baptized others; the baptism had an essentially different signification.

*Luke 2: 21, and 3: 23. †Mat 3: 13-16, Mark 1: 9. ‡Mark 1: 4. 5, Mat. 3: 6. 8, Luke 3: 3. 8. §Heb. 7: 26, 1 Pet. 2: 22.

4. *Jesus Christ did not receive the ordinance of christian baptism.* This appears, (1.) from the fact that christian baptism was not instituted till after Christ was baptized; nor indeed till some time after the death of John who administered the ordinance of baptism to him *(a)*. His, therefore, could not have been christian baptism. (2.) Christ received John's baptism. This was not the ordinance of christian baptism *(b)*. As the baptism which he received was John's, his, therefore, was not the ordinance of christian baptism. (3.) It is improper to baptize a person in his own name; because the baptized, in the very act of receiving the ordinance, come under baptismal engagements to render obedience to him in whose name the baptism is administered *(c)*. For a person to engage to render obedience to himself, and enter into a solemn obligation to do so, would be but solemn trifling. But if Christ was baptized in his own name, he thereby came under solemn baptismal engagements to obey himself personally. Of such trifling, Christ *was* not, *could* not be guilty. He was not therefore, baptized in his own name; and if he was not, then his was not the ordinance of christian baptism; for this must be administered in the name of the Son as well as of the Father and Spirit.* But it was very consistent with propriety for Christ, in a way peculiar to himself *(d)*, to receive John's baptism, which was not administered in the name of the Trinity *(e)*. It is evident then, that Christ's was not the christian ordinance of baptism. (4.) Christian baptism supposes sin in the person baptized. Where there is no sin, none can be washed away; nor can the sign of the washing away of sin, in such a case, have any appropriate signification. As Christ was personally and perfectly free from sinful defilement in nature and in practice, his could not be the ordinance of christian baptism; because this last symbolizes, among other things, the washing away of sin by the blood and Spirit of Christ *(f)*. As he had no personal sins, he did not suffer for himself; "but he was wounded for our transgressions;"—"He was delivered for our offences;"—"He died for the ungodly;"—for "sinners."† (5.) He did not need christian baptism. As Christ was inherently holy, neither

(a) Ch. 1, § 18, par. 2. *(b)* Ch. 1. § 18. *(c)* P. ii. Ch. 1, § 4. *See Mat. 28: 19. *(d)* § 3. *(e)* Ch. 1, § 11. *(f)* See P. iv. Ch. 1, § 9. †Isa. 53: 5, Rom. 4: 25, and 5: 6. 8.

His own sufferings, nor the renewing grace of the Spirit, could be necessary to make him so. He did not need these in any degree, for his own personal purification ; and therefore he did not need, could not, properly speaking, receive their external sign in the ordinance of christian baptism. Where the thing signified cannot in any degree exist in the nature of things, the external sign must be inappropriate. Christ being personally holy, did not need, and could not receive, the regenerating, converting, renewing grace of the holy Spirit. He could not then with propriety receive christian baptism which includes the symbolical representation of these. (6.) Christ's ministry on earth was under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant. He "was a minister of the circumcision ;" He observed the Old Testament ordinances of circumcision and the passover ; and with his expiring breath, he said ; "It is finished."* All this shows conclusively that his ministry on earth was under the Old Testament dispensation *(a)*. But christian baptism was not an Old Testament ordinance ; the baptism therefore which he received during his ministry on earth, could not be the New Testament ordinance of baptism.

5. *Jesus Christ was a Priest.* (1.) He is often so called. He is said to be "a priest,"—"a priest for ever,"—"a high priest,"—"a great high priest,"—"a priest after the order of Melchisedec."† (2.) He is said to have a "priesthood."‡ None but a priest can have a priesthood. (3.) As a priest, "he offered himself without spot unto God ;"—"he was offered to bear the sins of many ;"—"Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."§ This language and much more similar to it, teaches definitely that the Lord Jesus Christ was, and is, and will continue to be, a priest.

6. *Christ was, by his baptism, set apart to his priestly office.* He was a priest. As such, he, in order to comply with the Divine law, must be set apart to his office according to its requirements. The moral law did not require water to be applied to persons for any purpose ; neither did the civil law of the Jews.‖ No part of the ceremonial law re-

*Rom. 15: 8, Luke 2: 21, and 22: 15, John 13: 1, and 19: 30. *(a)* See Ch. 1, § 2. †Ps. 110: 4, Heb. 3. 1, and 4: 14, and 5: 5. 6. 10, and 6: 20. and 7: 11. 15. 17. 20. 21. 26, and 9: 11, and 10: 21,. ‡Heb. 7: 24. §Heb. 9: 14. 25. 28, 1 Cor. 5: 7. ‖See Ex. 20: 1–17, Lev. 17: 1–16, and 19: 1–37, and 20: 1–27.

quired the application of water to persons before, at or after, they were "thirty years of age"* as a religious ordinance, except that which required the priests to be thus set apart to their office. These were at first to serve "from thirty years old—until fifty years old." In after ages, they were required to serve "from the age of twenty years and upwards."† But before any of them could legally engage in officiating as priests, they must observe the law relating to their consecration. They must be, by Divine authority, set apart to their office. Therefore Jesus Christ, when he was "about thirty years of age,"‡ in giving the reason why he was then to be baptized or have water applied to him, says, it was "to fulfill all righteousness."§ "To fulfill all righteousness" is simply to comply perfectly with every portion of a righteous law. As Jesus Christ came into the world to fulfill perfectly every part of the Divine law; so, in entering on the public discharge of what the office of a priest required, he would comply with the Divine direction given to the Levitical priests by the ministry of Moses. God commanded Moses to "wash" Aaron and his sons "with water;" and he "washed them with water."‖ Here the priests are commanded to be washed with water. To comply with this law, our Saviour must be washed with water in some mode, before he could legally enter publicly upon his priestly office. These passages do not mention the mode by which the priests were to be washed, but another does. It is this; "Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them."¶ The Levites then, including the family of Aaron, were all to be washed by having "water of purifying" sprinkled on them when they were about to begin to minister in holy things. When Christ was about thirty years old, he was so far advanced in life, that no one on account of his age, could deny his right to enter publicly upon the office of a priest. But to enter this office legally, he must be baptized, or have water applied to him by a Levite of the family of Aaron, or of some other family. John was by birth a priest, and therefore as such, as well as from his office of prophet, and that of Christ's forerunner (*a*), he was a proper person to set apart legally, the Son of God to

*Luke 3: 23. †Num. 4: 3, 1 Chron. 23: 24, 2 Chron. 31: 17. ‡Luke 3: 23. §Mat. 3: 15. ‖Ex. 40: 12, Lev. 8: 6. ¶Num. 8: 7. (*a*) Ch. 1, § 1, par. 1–7.

his priestly office. For this purpose water must be applied to him, according to the provisions of the Levitical law. He was not taken to "the door of the tabernacle;"* for that was a mere circumstance, essential to the ordinance only when it was mentioned, and at no time connected with it only while the tabernacle stood. Since, therefore, our Saviour was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness," or in other words, to comply with the requirements of a just law; and since no law, except that which required the priests to be washed with water, required persons, at or about the age of thirty, to have water applied to them as an ordinance; it follows as an undeniable inference that he was baptized in order to be legally set apart to his priestly office.

7. *To complete his consecration as a priest, Christ was anointed.* The Levitical priests were to be anointed "throughout their generations." God said to Moses, "thou shalt anoint" Aaron;—"thou shalt anoint" his sons; and "Moses took of the anointing oil—and sprinkled it upon Aaron—and upon his sons."† From these and similar expressions it appears that the priests, Aaron and his sons, throughout their generations, were to be anointed with oil as a part of their consecration to qualify them to discharge publicly the duties of their office. The Lord Jesus Christ, when he was about to enter publicly upon his priestly office, was also anointed. He is (1.) called the "anointed" of the Lord.‡ (2.) He is often called the "Messiah" and "the Christ."§ The word Messiah in Hebrew and the word Christ in Greek, each denote the anointed.‖ (3.) He is said to be "anointed;" (4.) To be "anointed with the oil of gladness;" (5.) In this anointing, "the Spirit" was given him "without measure;" (6.) "The Lord"—"God," the Father "anointed" him with the Spirit.¶ That Christ might legally act as a priest, he was not only baptized; but he was also anointed with the Holy Spirit. This anointing was infinitely superior to that of mere oil. Our Saviour therefore was in every respect legally set apart for the public discharge of the functions of the priesthood. For this purpose, he was baptized; for this he was anointed.

*Ex. 40: 12. †Ex. 40; 13. 14. 15, Lev. 8; 12. 30. ‡Ps. 2: 2. §Dan. 9: 25, John 1; 41. ‖See Hebrew and Greek Lexicans on the words. ¶Ps. 45: 7, Isa. 61: 1, Luke 4: 18, John 3: 34, Acts 4: 27, and 10: 38.

8. *Christ was not baptized as a substitute for his people.* It is not said in any part of the word of God, that he was baptized for that purpose. To say that he was, is therefore to turn aside from the scriptures as a rule of duty*(a)*. It is often stated that he died to save "his people," "his sheep,"—and to be a ransom for "many;"* but in no passage of scripture, is it said that he was baptized for his people or as a substitute for them. Moreover, he lived under the Old Testament dispensation, when the ordinance of christian baptism was not required of his people*(b)*. Hence they did not need a substitute to do that for them, which they themselves were not in duty bound to do. Besides, he himself expressly mentions the reason why he was baptized. To "fulfill all righteousness," not to be a substitute for his people, is the reason he gives for receiving John's baptism. The Lord Jesus Christ was not therefore baptized as a substitute for his people.

9. *He was not baptized to set an example for his followers.* No such instruction is given in the Holy book of God. Our Saviour himself definitely declares that he was baptized for a certain purpose. This was "to fulfill all righteousness," not to set an example for his followers. He definitely states for what he was baptized. Men tell us that, in receiving John's baptism, he had a design different from that which he mentions. He says he was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness;" men say, he was baptized to set his followers an example. Which are we bound to believe? Jesus Christ? or mere man? Christians believe what Christ says on this subject as well as on others, rather than the mere assertions of mere men.

10. *If Christ, in his baptism, did set an example, it is not imitated by his followers.* To imitate an example set by a person, is to do what the person did. A number of things concurred in our Saviour's baptism. (1.) He "was baptized" by "John;" (2.) "In" or at or near the "Jordan;" (3.) "With" its waters; (4.) When he was "about thirty years of age;" (5.) Not "in the name of the Father," "Son" and "Holy Ghost;" and (6) "To fulfill" the requirements of the Levitical law which pointed out the mode of consecrating the priests. All this we learn from the po-

(a) See rule No. 4. 5. *Mat. 1: 21, John 10: 11. 15, Mat. 20:28. *(b)* Ch. 1, § 4, par. 6.

sitive declarations of God's word.* To imitate our Saviour's example in baptism, it is necessary to comply with all these points. None now pretend to be baptized by John; for he has been dead more than 1800 years. Very few are baptized at the Jordan or with its waters; nor do any pretend that persons can be baptized by its waters and by no others. None put off their baptism till they are thirty years of age. By all who baptize with water, except the Subians of Syria, some Arians*(a)*, and perhaps a few others: the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is used in baptism. Nor are any baptized "to fulfill" the requirements of the Levitical law. After John's death, and in countries remote from the river Jordan; no one ever has or ever could imitate Christ in his baptism. Why then do men who plunge persons in a pond, brook or cistern, more than five thousand miles from the Jordan, talk of imitating Christ in his baptism? Do they not know that they do not imitate, in any one of its parts, the baptism of our blessed Saviour? They do not even plunge in the Jordan as they *say* John did. Do they really suppose that persons who think for themselves, can imagine that to be plunged in any water by any person, is to follow the example of the Lord Jesus Christ who was baptized by John in, or at the Jordan? Can they believe that a brook, pond or cistern, in America, Europe or Africa, is the river Jordan in Asia? Can they imagine that he who immerses them is John the Baptist? If they cannot; how can they be so duped as to imagine that they imitate the example of Christ, when they are plunged in water five thousand miles from the Jordan, in the name of the Trinity, by a person they know is not John the Baptist? As Christ was not baptized by the *same person*, or by the *same officer*, or in the *same name*, or *for the same purpose*, or in *the same place(b)*, that his followers are; therefore they do not imitate him in his baptism.

If his baptism was intended as an example for his followers, the whole of it must be imitated. An example must be followed in all its parts. This must be the case, from its very nature as an example. If the whole is not to be fol-

*Mat. 3: 13–16, Mark 1: 8. 9, Luke 3: 23, Acts 19: 2–5. *(a)* The Arians deny the supreme deity of Jesus Christ. It is said that in Great Britain and Ireland, some of them baptize in the name of God, not using the words Father, Son and Holy Ghost. See B. iv. P. iv, Ch 3, § 3. *(b)* Ch. 1, § 1. 17. 18, Ch. 2, § 2. 4. 6.

lowed ; who is to determine which part of the example is to be imitated, and which is not ? If one person, without Divine authority, may refuse to imitate one part of an example, another person may refuse to imitate another of its parts; and thus, by different persons, the whole example might be set aside, or be rendered totally useless. What therefore is given to us as an example, must be imitated in all its parts, unless God makes exceptions ; and then the excepted parts do not belong in fact to the example. What is not given as an example for our imitation, we have no right to make such.

Immersers *say*, though the word of God does not, that Christ was plunged in Jordan by John the Baptist. They *say*, this was for an example to his followers ; though Christ gives a different reason for his baptism *(a)*. But if our Saviour was baptized to set an example for his followers, then immersers do not follow it in any one of its parts. They do not go to the Jordan, are not plunged by John, and most of them have the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost used when they are immersed. They do not therefore imitate any part of the example which they say our Saviour set them. Besides, no one does or ever did follow it since the death of John. Even those who are most ready to boast of their fidelity in this respect, are as far from doing what he did when he was baptized, as they frequently are from obeying his positive commands in other matters.

Even if he were plunged in the Jordan, those who are plunged in another stream, no more imitate the baptism of Christ in such an act, than would the person who should go near the river Jordan without having a drop of water applied to him. Neither would imitate Christ in his baptism ; for to do a very small part of what he did, is not to imitate his example. Indeed to pretend that we follow his example when we only aim at doing a very small part of what we say he did, is, at best, but solemn trifling.

It is the business of the christian to take for examples, those actions which the word of God mentions as such. He has no right to make that an example which the scriptures do not present for our imitation. Christ was circumcised when he was "eight days" old ; he was "baptized" when he was "about thirty years of age ;" and just before his

(a) § 9.

death he "eat" the "passover."* But not the least hint is given which might lead us to suppose that any one of these his actions, was intended as an example which his followers are to imitate. His baptism we know was not intended for our imitation; because he himself positively declares that his baptism was intended for another purpose *(a)*. To take it therefore as an example, is, in this matter to act, not only without Divine authority; but it is to act in direct opposition to the positive declaration of the Lord Jesus Christ, when he says, he was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness."†

Jesus Christ complied with all the Divine institutions which were in force during his ministry on earth. In this way he honored, as well as "magnified" "the law."‡ In the same manner also, men are bound to comply with all the Divine institutions which are in force during the dispensation under which they live. He introduced none of the traditions of men into religion. He in fact excluded from it, every invention of man.§ All should do this; because the word of God directs the whole human family in religious duties to go "to the law and to the testimony." It declares, "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."‖ What does not accord with God's word, is destitute of Divine light, and cannot therefore be, or be made by man, a part of Spiritual religion.

CHAPTER III.

THE BAPTISM WHICH CHRIST AND HIS DISCIPLES ADMINISTERED BEFORE HIS RESURRECTION.

1. *Jesus Christ himself baptized his twelve Apostles.* The testimony of God's word is very plain on this point. (1.) It is positively declared that "Jesus and his disciples" came "into the land of Judea and there he tarried with them and baptized."¶ He came into "Judea" with "his disciples," "tarried with them" and "baptized." If it be asked, whom did he baptize? the answer must be; he baptized "them." If it is asked, who are intended by the word "them?" the answer must be, "his disciples." The language when examined is very definite. Jesus Christ therefore baptized his

*Luke 2: 21, and 3: 21. 33, and 22: 15. *(a)* § 6–9. †Mat. 3: 15. ‡Isa. 42: 21. §See Mat 5: 33. 34. 43. 44, and 15: 9. ‖Isa. 8: 20. ¶John 3: 22.

twelve disciples. (2.) The disciples of John in addressing him, teach the same truth. They say to him; "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness; behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him."* They declare the fact that Jesus baptized; but they do not say that he baptized all men; nor that he baptized all who came to him. Here then we have another passage to prove the fact that our Saviour administered baptism. (3.) It is also stated that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John."† Two facts are here presented for our consideration. The first is; Jesus made and baptized disciples; the second, he made and baptized more disciples than John. The immediate followers of Christ were "the twelve."‡ The number of John's immediate disciples or attendants was less than twelve; for Christ's disciples or immediate attendants, were only "twelve," and they exceeded John's in number. John's must therefore have been less than twelve. (4.) Jesus did not baptize any but "the twelve." This is manifest from the fact that when it is said that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John;" it is immediately added, "Jesus baptized not" any others, "but his disciples" did.§ Our Saviour baptized his twelve disciples in Enon. This is clearly intimated, if not expressed, in this language; "Jesus—baptized" his disciples; "and John also was baptizing in Enon,"—"and they came and were baptized."‖ To say that John *also* baptized in Enon, shows that Jesus Christ, who just before is said to have baptized, administered the ordinance in that place as well as John. If he had not, the word *also* would not have been used in that connection.

2. *The twelve Apostles, or at least some of them, baptized before the resurrection of Christ.* This is taught in the expression, "Jesus—baptized not but his disciples;"¶ that is, "his disciples" baptized. Who were baptized by the twelve, we are not informed. They may, however, have baptized the "seventy" disciples, or the "hundred and twenty," whom Peter addressed immediately after the ascension of Christ.** A part of these might in fact have been the seventy sent out by our Saviour to every city which he

*John 3: 26. †John 4: 1. ‡Mat 10: 1, and 11: 1, Mark 3: 14, and 6: 7, Luke 6: 13, and 9: 1. §John 4: 1. 2. ‖3: 22. 23. ¶4: 2. **Luke 10: 1, Acts 1: 15.

intended to visit personally during his ministry on earth. But, that the disciples of Christ baptized some persons before his resurrection, is certain from the language already quoted.

3. *The baptism which the disciples of Christ administered before his resurrection, was administered by his authority.* He himself baptized by his own authority as King and Head of his own church. He needed no commission from any other being to authorize him to administer baptism. But his disciples being mere men, must derive all their authority to administer Divine ordinances from a Divine Person. That he authorized them to baptize, may be learned; (1.) from the fact that at the time they administered baptism, they were with him.* (2.) He did not reprove them for baptizing. This he would certainly have done, had they attempted to baptize without his approbation. (3.) The whole passage, where it is stated that they baptized, shows that they administered the ordinance with his approbation and authority.* That he therefore authorized them to baptize, cannot in truth be denied.

4. *The baptism administered by the disciples of Christ, was confined to the Jewish nation.* When Christ sent them out before his resurrection; he commanded them not to go "into the way of the Gentiles," or enter "into any city of the Samaritans;" but to go "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."† They were not by this authority, allowed to go among the Gentiles or into any Samaritan city; and as this was the only commission under which they acted, till after the resurrection of Christ, it must, in all its parts, have been confined to the Jewish nation. By it they were not permitted so much as to go among other nations. They therefore could not by it be allowed to baptize any but Jews.

5. *This commission to go among the Jews only, did not include succession.* It was given to individuals. It did not authorize them to send out others as Christ had sent them out. They therefore could not, by this commission transfer to others, the powers which, by it, they had received.‡ It did not therefore include succession, or authorize those to whom it was given to transfer its powers to other persons.

*See John 3: 22. 23, and 4: 1. 2. †Mat. 10: 5. 6. ‡See Mat. 10: 5-20

6. *The baptism which Christ personally administered, was not the ordinance of christian baptism.* This will be evident from a few considerations. (1.) He administered this baptism before the Old Testament dispensation terminated. This ended at his death(*a*). Before this, he baptized his twelve disciples.* (2.) When he baptized the twelve, the ordinance of christian baptism was not instituted. Its institution did not take place till after his resurrection.† (3.) Christ's mission on earth was limited to the Jews. He declares, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."‡ Christian baptism as an ordinance extended to "all nations." When therefore Christ administered the ordinance only to Jews, and to but twelve of them; it could not be that which might be extended to Gentiles also. (4.) "The eleven disciples" and their successors in office, were all that were commissioned to administer the ordinance of christian baptism.§ Christ was not one of these. He commissioned the eleven and their successors in the ministerial office to baptize; and he might if he had chosen to do so, have administered the ordinance; but we have no evidence that what he administered personally was the ordinance of christian baptism. From these and other evidences which might be adduced, it may be clearly ascertained that the baptism which our Saviour personally administered before his resurrection, was not the ordinance usually called christian baptism.

7. *The baptism which the disciples administered before the resurrection of Christ, was not christian baptism.* This is ascertained, (1.) From the fact that the Old Testament dispensation had not then terminated, nor the New commenced(*b*). Of the New, not of the Old dispensation, is christian baptism an ordinance. (2.) This their first commission was confined to the Jews and did not include succession(*c*). The baptism under it could not therefore be christian baptism; because the commission authorizing that, extended to "all nations" and included succession "even unto the end of the world."‖ (3.) When they administered baptism before the death of Christ, the Old Testament ordinance

(*a*) Ch. 1, § 2 par. 5. 6. *Mat. 10: 5 6. †See Mat. 28: 6. 19. ‡Mat. 15: 24. §See Mat. 28: 19. (*b*) See Ch. 1, § 2. (*c*) § 4. 5. ‖Mat. 28: 19. 20.

of the "passover"* was in full force(*a*). Christian baptism therefore which is a New Testament ordinance, could not be in full force at the same time. These reasons, with many others which might be mentioned, show that the baptism administered by the disciples of Christ before his resurrection, was not in very deed, the ordinance of christian baptism.

8. *The baptism which Christ and his twelve disciples administered before his resurrection, was designed to be a substitute for christian baptism.* To perceive clearly the truth of this proposition, it will be necessary to attend with care to several points. (1.) If Christ, in his wisdom saw fit, he had a right to institute an ordinance which should, for the time being and in special cases, be a substitute for christian baptism. Those very perfections by which he might authoritatively institute the positive ordinance of christian baptism, might, if he chose, be exercised in instituting a substitute for it to be and continue in force for a time. As head of his church, he had a right to institute positive ordinances; and therefore, if he saw proper, he might institute substitutes for them. But this prerogative does not belong to mere creatures. (2.) With Christ, "the twelve" disciples "eat the" last "passover."† At this time their circumcision was in force as the seal of the covenant; for "no uncircumcised person"‡ was allowed to eat of the passover. If an "uncircumcised" person even entered the "sanctuary,"§ it was thereby rendered ceremonially unclean. An uncircumcised person was not, by Divine authority, permitted to enter a sacred place; much less to eat the passover. When therefore the disciples eat of the paschal sacrifice with Christ's approbation; their circumcision then must have been valid. (3.) A person's standing in the New Testament church, was indicated by baptism, not by circumcision. This was the case with the Jews who had been circumcised, as well as with the Gentiles who had not received that "seal of the righteousness" of faith.‖ Paul, though a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" and "circumcised the eighth day," yet when he was about to enter the New Testament church, was directed to "be baptized;" and "he arose and

*Luke 22: 15. (*a*) Ch. 1, § 2. †Mat. 26; 17-25, Mark 14: 12-21, Luke 22: 7-15. ‡Ex. 12: 48. §Ezek. 44: 7. 9. ‖Rom. 4: 11.

was baptized."* He was taught by the Holy Spirit that his "circumcision" was then "nothing."† As, in New Testament times this sign did not avail "any thing" to those who were "in Christ Jesus"‡ or to others; it could not therefore under the New dispensation be a seal of God's covenant. While circumcision was a "token" or seal of the "everlasting covenant" which Divine mercy had made with his visible people, so far from being at that time "nothing" and of no avail, its "advantage" was great "every way."§ But when, as a religious rite, it became "nothing;" then the Jews or "the men of Judea" and those who dwelt "at Jerusalem," having asked; "What shall we do?" were directed to "be baptized." This direction was given on "the day of Pentecost," fifty days after our Saviour's crucifixion. It was given to those who, because they were Jews, were circumcised. In the case of these therefore, as well as in that of Paul, we are taught that the standing of the circumcised Jew in the New Testament church, was to be known and acknowledged by baptism, not by circumcision. The standing in the visible church of Cornelius and his "friends" who were all "Gentiles," was recognized and acknowledged by baptism ¶ The yoke of circumcision was not therefore laid upon any in New Testament times.** Were it necessary, much additional evidence might be adduced to prove that the standing of every member in the New Testament church, was publicly acknowledged by baptism, and that of not one of them by circumcision. (4.) No unbaptized person can be publicly recognized as a member of the New Testament church, or have in it a ratified standing. By Divine authority, and by that only, can a creature enter into covenant relation with God. By the same authority must this relation be recognized and confirmed. "Be baptized" was the direction of God to all who desired to enjoy a ratified standing as members of the New Testament church; and those who were publicly acknowledged as its members, were "baptized" at the time the public recognition of their membership took place.†† In the word of God, there is no precept or example authorizing unbaptized persons to be

*Acts 9: 18, and 22: 16. †1 Cor 7: 19. ‡Gal. 5: 6. §Gen. 17: 7 13, Rom. 3: 1. 2. ‖Acts 2: 1. 14. 37. 38. ¶Acts 10: 24. 45. 47, 48. **See Acts 15: 1. 6-20. 24. 28. 29. ††Acts 2. 41, and 8: 12. 13. 37. 38, and 10: 47. 48, and 16: 15. 33.

publicly acknowledged as ratified members of God's church in New Testament times. As under the Old Testament the covenant was not ratified by those who were in it, till the seal of circumcision was applied to them; so in New Testament times, the covenant is not ratified or completed in all its parts till baptism is received. No unbaptized person can therefore, be an acknowledged member of the church in New Testament times; nor can any such person be entitled to its special privileges. (5.) The apostles of Christ had an acknowledged standing in the New Testament church. This appears from the fact that they performed all the duties required of its members and enjoyed all the privileges which any of its members could enjoy. They received the sacrament of the Lord's supper; they held the office of New Testament ministers; they administered the New Testament ordinances of baptism and the holy supper.* They must therefore have had a standing in the New Testament church. This must, in their case, have been publicly acknowledged and ratified. This standing did not, as has been shown(*a*), belong to them in consequence of their circumcision. By baptism therefore they must have been publicly recognized and acknowledged as ratified members of the New Testament church, and therefore entitled to all its privileges. Jesus Christ baptized them(*b*). There is not, in the whole word of God, the least shadow of evidence, that they were re-baptized, either before or after the death of Christ. The baptism therefore which Jesus Christ administered to them, and in consequence of which, (for we have no evidence that they received any other) they were publicly recognized as ratified members of the visible church in New Testament times, must have been, either christian baptism or a substitute for that ordinance. But it was not, as we have seen(*c*), in fact the christian ordinance of baptism; for that, in the case of the apostles, it must therefore have been a substitute. (6.) Till the disciples "eat the" last "passover" with the Lord Jesus Christ, their circumcision was a valid seal of the covenant; for "no uncircumcised person" might "eat thereof."† As soon as that passover was "kept" by them, their baptism became a valid substitute for christian bap-

*See Mat. 26: 26. 27. and 28: 19. Acts 2: 42. 46, and 16: 15. 33, and 20: 7, 1 Cor. 1: 14. 16, and 11: 23–29 (*a*) par. 3. (*b*) § 1. (*c*) § 6. †Ex. 12: 48.

tism ; for no unbaptized person can have a ratified, publicly acknowledged standing in the New Testament church ; or be authorized to eat the Lord's supper, preach the gospel or administer New Testament ordinances(*a*) ; and all this, with much more, the disciples did. Their circumcision then was valid till the last passover was kept and then their baptism became and remained a valid substitute for christian baptism.

By similar evidence, it may be proved; that, if any of those to whom the apostles administered baptism before the resurrection of Christ, were, after this, publicly recognized as members of the New Testament church ; their baptism was also, by the Saviour, intended to answer as a substitute for the ordinance of christian baptism.

PART FOURTH.

BAPTISM ADMINISTERED BY DIVINE AUTHORITY AFTER THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

1. *Christian baptism was not instituted till after the resurrection of Christ.* That baptism unto Moses and the divers washings or baptisms used in the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, were not the ordinance of christian baptism, is too evident to need illustration. John's was not christian baptism (*b*), nor was that administered to Jesus Christ (*c*); nor yet was that administered to or by the twelve apostles before the resurrection of Christ, the ordinance of christian baptism (*d*). That the ordinance of christian baptism was not instituted at the same time with the Eucharist, is manifest from the fact that at that time not one word is spoken concerning baptism.* Nor is baptism so much as mentioned while Christ was on the cross or in the tomb.† There is not therefore the least shadow of evidence to prove that christian baptism was instituted before the resurrection of our Sa-

(*a*) Par. 4. 5. (*b*) P. iii, Ch. 1, § 18. (*c*) P. iii, Ch. 2, § 4. (*d*) P. iii, Ch. 3, § 6. 7. 8. *See Mat. 26: 14–29, Mark 14: 12–26, Luke 22: 7–20. †See Mat. 27: 29–66, and 28: 1–8, Mark 15: 15–47, and 16: 1–11, Luke 23: 27–56, and 24: 1–12.

viour. Those then who take the word of God for their rule of duty (*a*) cannot believe that it was instituted before that event.

2. *Christian baptism is an instituted ordinance.* An instituted ordinance is an external requirement which is to be performed in succeeding generations. That which is required to be done in it, must be perceptible by the senses. It must also represent something Spiritual. He who issues the command by which an ordinance is instituted, must have the requisite authority, or the observance of the ordinance, instead of being a religious duty, would be but solemn trifling. In christian baptism is found every thing that is essential to an instituted ordinance (*b*), and therefore it must be such.

3. *Jesus Christ after his resurrection instituted the ordinance of christian baptism.* In the command to his disciples to teach "all nations, baptizing them,"* he instituted the ordinance of christian baptism. He commanded it to be observed. A visible emblem was to be used (*c*); it was to be performed in succeeding ages (*d*); and the command was given by him who had the requisite authority. Before he gave the command to teach and baptize "all nations," he declared; "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth."† As in his human nature merely, he could not receive "all power;" and as in his Divine nature, he already possessed this power (*e*); he therefore in his human and Divine natures united in one Person, might and did receive all power "in Heaven and in earth." Jesus Christ therefore as Emmanuel, "God with us,"‡ instituted the ordinance of christian baptism. Being possessed of "all power," and being "Head over all things to the church,"§ he had all the authority which was requisite to institute this ordinance. He did this after the Angel had expressly stated; "He is not here" in the tomb; "He is risen as he said."‖ It is evident therefore, (1.) That Jesus Christ instituted the ordinance of christian baptism; (2.) That this was a mediatorial act; for he, as God and man in one Person, instituted this ordinance; (3.) That he instituted it after his resurrection; (4.) That persons were to receive this ordinance.

(*a*) See Rule No. 5. (*b*) § 3. 4. *Mat. 28: 19 in Greek. (*c*) § 4. (*d*) § 8. (*e*) P. i, Ch. 2, § 4. †Mat. 28: 18. ‡Mat. 1: 23. §Eph 1; 22. ‖Mat. 28: 6.

4. *Water is the visible emblem to be used in christian baptism.* (1.) The command by which Christ authorized his disciples to administer the ordinance of christian baptism, shows that they were to baptize with water *(a)*. These actually administered the ordinance which was required by their commission. (2.) Inspired men used water when they baptized. Peter enquires; "Can any man forbid water that" Cornelius and his friends "should not be baptized?" and the Eunuch said; "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" And after he and Philip "went down into the water,"—the Eunuch was "baptized."* These, and many other similar expressions, show clearly that water is to be used in administering the ordinance of christian baptism. (3.) It is to be clean water; for God, speaking to his people of New Testament times, says; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you."† In this passage, we are taught by the prophet of the Lord that clean water is to be used by Divine authority in the New Testament church. But in this, water is used as a Divine ordinance only in baptism. In fulfilling this prediction therefore, clean water must be used in baptism. It is evident then, from God's word, that clean water is the visible emblem which Divine wisdom has authorized to be used when christian baptism is administered.

5. *The eleven Apostles and their successors in the ministerial office, are authorized to administer christian baptism.* Our Saviour after proving by his resurrection from the dead, that he possessed all power in Heaven and in earth, said to "the eleven disciples;" "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them." Before Christ gave them this command, they had no authority to teach and baptize the various nations of the earth; because, before this, no such authority was given them. In this command "the eleven" received their commission as ministers of the New Testament church; for at this time and not before, they are directed to teach and baptize all nations This direction was in fact their commission to act as his ambassadors. Without it, they had no authority either to preach to the nations or baptize them. For them or others to attempt to do either

(a) P. i, Ch. 1, § 3. P. i, Ch. 2. § 2. 3. *Acts 10: 47, and 8: 36. 38. †Ezek. 36: 25.

without Divine authority, would be mere will-worship or rebellion against the King of Zion. But while "the eleven" received this ministerial commission from the Lord Jesus Christ, it was not confined to them personally. They were to transmit to others their office of gospel ministers. That their commission was not confined to their own persons, but that it was to be handed down to others, is manifest from the promise which it contains. It is this; "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."* The commission must either be transmitted to others; or these must live till the end of time. But, as Christ taught his disciples explicitly, that they should die;† it follows therefore that this their commission was to be transferred to others. It was to be transmitted "to faithful men who" should "be able to teach others."‡ Those who were to receive from them, and be their successors in, this office, were to be faithful to the Lord Jesus Christ, or true believers. They were also to be men of learning who should be able to teach others to observe "all things whatsoever" he had "commanded" in his word.§ To do this, even in a degree, much knowledge is necessary. Since therefore the ministerial commission given to "the eleven" is to be transferred from them through their successors in office from generation to generation "unto the end of the world;" it is certain that whatever this commission required them to do, is required of all to whom it is transmitted by our Saviour's authority. Those to whom it was personally given, were to teach and baptize, and also to administer the Lord's supper.‖ Those therefore who have proper authority to teach all that he commanded in his word; or in other words, to preach the gospel, and also to administer New Testament ordinances, have this commission transmitted to them. To teach what the word of God contains and to administer these ordinances, is precisely what "the eleven" were, and their successors in office are, empowered to do by this commission. As the whole commission was therefore given to the eleven, and as they were to "commit" it "to faithful men who should be able to teach others" what it required to be taught; that part of it requiring them to administer baptism must belong to all to whom the whole com-

*Mat. 28: 16. 18. 19. 20. †Mat. 10: 28, and 24: 9, Luke 21: 16, John 16: 2, Acts 12: 2.
‡2 Tim. 2: 2. §Mat. 28: 20. ‖See 1 Cor. 11: 23–29.

mission is intrusted ; that is, to the eleven and to their successors in the ministerial office. But Christ authorized no others to preach or baptize.

"The eleven" had another commission given them before they were intrusted with this. It was their apostolic commission. To have this, the person must, (1.) see the Lord Jesus Christ with his natural eyes. (2.) He must be appointed to it by a personal act of Christ. (3.) He must be able to work miracles. (4.) This commission cannot be transferred or committed to others by him to whom it is given. (5.) Those who claim, the apostolic office, unless they have these marks are called "liars."* When a man exhibits these marks to prove that his is the apostolic commission; all are bound to admit his authority. But if he who claims to have the apostolic commission of the disciples, cannot show these signs of an apostle ; all are bound to treat him as a deceiver who lays claim to that which he does not possess. True ministers of Christ claim the ministerial, not the apostolic office of the eleven.

6. *Christian baptism must be administered in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.* This, in the commission to teach and baptize, our Saviour expressly requires. He positively commands his ministering servants to baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."† In administering the ordinance of baptism, he has not authorized them to omit this name or substitute another in its place. If persons do either therefore when they apply water to others; their act, with such an omission or alteration, cannot be the baptism which Christ requires to be administered ; for this must be administered in the name of the Trinity. To omit, in baptism, the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, would be to attempt to baptize in no name or in an unauthorized one. In either case the act would be but solemn mockery. Whoever therefore has received christian baptism, has been baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; for Christ has not authorized any person either directly or indirectly to administer it in any other name.

7. *Christian baptism is to be administered to Gentiles as well as Jews.* This is taught, (1.) in the commission given

*See Mat. 10: 1-15, Luke 9: 1-6, Acts 1: 21-26, and 9: 17, and 26: 16, Rom. 1: 1-5, and 15: 19, 1 Cor. 1: 1, and 4: 9, and 9: 1, and 12: 28, 2 Cor. 11: 13, and 12: 12, Eph. 4: 11, Rev. 2: 2, Gal. 1: 1, 1 Cor. 15: 8. †Mat. 28: 19.

to baptize. The disciples and their successors in office are commanded to "teach all nations, baptizing them."* All nations is an expression which includes both Jews and Gentiles. (2.) In obedience to the requirement contained in this commission, both Jews and Gentiles were baptized by inspired men. On "the day of Pentecost," many Jews "were baptized."† Soon after Stephen's martyrdom, not a few "men and women" in Samaria, "were baptized."‡ "Cornelius,"—"his kinsmen and near friends," were "Gentiles." On them the Holy Ghost was poured out; and they were "baptized."§ It is clear therefore that christian baptism is to be administered to Gentiles as well as Jews.

8. *Christian baptism is to continue in the New Testament church till the end of time.* (1.) As the whole commission requiring this baptism to be administered, is to remain in full force(*a*) "even unto the end of the world;"‖ so that part of it requiring this ordinance must remain in force as long. (2.) The eleven and their successors in office are required to administer baptism as one part of their official duty, till the world shall end(*a*)¶; so long therefore will the ordinance continue to be administered. (3.) There is no evidence either in the word of God or in the nature of christian baptism to prove that it will be discontinued in the church of Christ. Convincing evidence is therefore presented to the mind that this ordinance is to be observed in the christian church "even unto the end of the world."

9. *Christian baptism is a significant ordinance.* In the Lord's supper, is a lively emblem of the "death" of Christ. The bread broken aptly symbolizes his sufferings on the cross; and the wine poured out, his blood shed.** When he died, his soul and body were separated. His burial was no part of his sufferings or death, though it was of his humiliation. Had his soul and body continued separate, the ordinance of christian baptism would not have been instituted; for it was not till after he rose from the dead, that he directed his ministering servants to go and "teach all nations, baptizing them." When he rose from the dead, his soul and body were re-united again. This re-union, not his departure from the tomb, constituted his resurrection. He, after

*Mat. 28: 19. †Acts 2: 1. 41. ‡Acts 8: 2. 9. 12. §Acts. 10: 1.24. 45. 47.48. ‖Mat. 28: 20. (*a*)§ 5. ¶Mat. 28: 19. 20. **See 1 Cor. 11: 23–29.

he rose from the dead, instituted the ordinance of christian baptism to represent the work of the Holy Spirit which he, as a living Saviour, sends forth into the hearts of sinners to renew and sanctify them(a). That christian baptism signifies or represents the work of the Spirit, in its various parts, will appear to the reflecting mind when the attention is directed to a few passages in God's word which mention this subject. Christian baptism signifies, (1.) Regeneration by the power of the Holy Spirit. Of true christians it is said, "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Of this same work that is here called baptism, it is said "the Spirit quickeneth"* all in whom new life is produced. As regeneration or the quickening power of the Spirit on the soul, is called baptism, so baptism must represent that operation of the Holy Ghost, by which a sinner is new-created in Christ Jesus the Lord.† (2.) It signifies conversion or the new birth which is the necessary effect of regeneration. Christ says of true believers that they are "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" that is, of God the Spirit: and again, "except a man be born of water," or is baptized,—"he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" on earth, or become a member of the New Testament church: and, "except a man be born—of the Spirit," or made a new creature by the converting grace of the Holy Ghost,—"he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" above.‡ (3.) It represents the coming of Christ by his Spirit, into the soul of his people. Jesus Christ, it is said, "came by water and blood."§ In New Testament times, water is used only in christian baptism as an ordinance in the church. When therefore it is said that Jesus Christ came by water, it must be by water in baptism as an emblem of his Spirit's influence. (4.) It signifies union to or ingrafting into Christ. It is affirmed that "so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death:" it is said again; "as the body is one—so also is Christ; for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body:"

(a) The Lord Jesus Christ did not institute an ordinance of any kind, either to symbolize or represent the act of laying his dead body in the tomb; for a mere man, Joseph of Arimathea, performed this act, as is taught in Mat. 27: 57–60, Mark 15: 42–46, Luke 23: 50–53. Nor did he institute any ordinance to represent or commemorate the departure of his body from the tomb after it was restored to life; for this was an act that his mere human nature or even a mere creature might have performed. *1 Cor. 12: 13, John 6: 63. †See 2 Cor. 5: 17, Eph. 2: 10. ‡John 1: 13, and 3: 5. §1 John 5: 6.

and yet again; "as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ."* If those who are baptized with water, are united to Christ by faith; then they possess both the sign and that which it signifies. But while the baptized live in a state of unbelief, the sign only is theirs. (5.) It represents the remission of sins. This appears from the declaration of God by Peter to the Jews; "Repent and be baptized every one of you—for the remission of sins;"† and therefore justification for the sake of the righteousness of Christ imputed to the soul; for remission or the pardon of sin, cannot in the subjects of it, be separated from justification by faith, or from sanctification in its origin in the soul. (6.) It denotes the sanctifying work of Christ's Spirit: for Jesus "Christ—loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," through the effectual operation of his Spirit. To Paul it was said; "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins;"‡ and those who were baptized into Christ's death, are said to "walk in newness of life;"§ or to live a life of faith upon the Son of God. (7.) It signifies salvation from sin and from its consequences. As the salvation of "eight souls" in the ark from the universal deluge, represented the salvation of those who are united to Christ by faith, from the flood of Divine wrath which shall one day sweep away all others; so baptism with water is an external "figure" of that spiritual baptism which all must experience who have been, or ever shall be saved from sin and hell.‖ It is manifest from these observations that christian baptism is a significant ordinance; and that it is an external sign of the work of Christ's Spirit in the souls of his people.

10. *Christian baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament church.* It has all the properties of such a sacrament. Christ as mediator instituted this ordinance(*a*). It has water for a sign(*b*). This may be perceived by the senses. It signifies and seals spiritual blessings(*c*). That which is all this, must be a sacrament or a holy ordinance, by the participation of which, persons are solemnly bound in covenant to render obedience to him in whose name it is administer-

*Rom. 6: 3, 1 Cor. 12: 12. 13. Gal. 3: 27. †Acts 2: 38. ‡Eph. 5: 25. 26, 2 Thes. 2: 13. John 17: 17, Acts 22: 16. §Rom. 6: 4. ‖See 1 Pet. 3: 20. 21. (*a*) § 3. (*b*) § 4. (*c*) § 9, 11.

ed(a). No ordinance can be a New Testament sacrament without all these. Even the Old Testament sacraments embraced them all except being instituted by our Saviour while on earth. In fact one of them, is expressly called "a seal of the righteousness of—faith."* This therefore was a sign and seal of spiritual blessings. Christian baptism is then a New Testament sacrament; because in it is found all that necessarily belongs to such a sacrament.

11. *Christian baptism is a seal by which blessings are confirmed.* No unbaptized person can be publicly recognized as a member of the visible church in its New Testament dispensation(b). Every person who is properly baptized, is, from that fact, recognized as a member of the visible church. This truth the word of God clearly teaches; "they that gladly received the word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto" the then visible church "about five thousand souls;"—"and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Even Simon the Samaritan sorcerer, "when he was baptized—continued with Philip."† Being baptized, he was so externally united with the visible people of God, that he continued with them. Those who are baptized members of the visible church, are often said to be sealed. No others are thus described. But since the baptized, and they only, are said to be sealed; baptism must therefore be the seal; or, in other words, the seal and christian baptism are merely two names for the same thing. The visible church in its members, is baptized. This same church is called "a fountain seal."‡ Paul, under the inspiring influence of the Holy Spirit, says of himself and other christians; "God—hath sealed us and given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts."§ The seal is here mentioned as something distinct from the work of the Spirit in the heart. One angel said to others; "Hurt not the earth—till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads."‖ All baptized church members are, by profession, "sealed" servants of God. The angel noticed and marked these. For their sake, the earth was to be spared for a time. The number of the "sealed" is very great. For them God manifests a special

(a)§ 12. 13. *Rom. 4: 11. (b)P. iii, Ch. 3, § 8, par. 4. †Acts 2: 41, 42, and 8: 9, 13. ‡Song 4: 12. §2 Cor. 1: 21, 22. ‖Rev. 7: 3, 4.

regard. The "locusts" were commanded to hurt "only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads."* This intimates that those who *were "sealed"* should not be hurt by the locusts. "To the saints—at Ephesus and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," it is said; "after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance."† The seal of the regenerating, converting and justifying grace of the Spirit, was applied to their souls the moment they believed; for "all that believe are justified,"—are "justified by faith;" to them is "now no condemnation," and they "are born of God" the Spirit.‡ But, as these Ephesians and others "were sealed *after*" they "believed;" the seal here mentioned must have been an external one applied to them by Divine authority; or in other words, they received the baptismal seal after they believed, as they had not previously been baptized. From the preceding passages of scripture and others that might be quoted, it appears evident that persons are by baptism publicly recognized, under the New Testament dispensation, as members of the visible church; and that all baptized persons are, by profession, sealed servants of God. It is also manifest that christian baptism is a seal which confirms both temporal and spiritual blessings to the baptized.

12. *Christian baptism requires obedience to be rendered to him in whose name it is administered.* To be baptized "in the name," is to be baptized by the authority "of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."§ In the administration therefore of this ordinance, the Triune God in whose name it is administered, claims sovereign authority. This includes the claim of obedience, prompt, implicit and universal. When therefore baptism is administered in the name of the Trinity; obedience to the Triune God is unequivocally demanded. To baptize a person (εις) into the name of Father, Son and Spirit,‖ is expressive of union to the Triune God as a sovereign. This relation includes a demand of obedience from the person baptized. Christian baptism therefore which must always be administered in or (εις) into the name of the Trinity (*a*) requires the baptized to render obedience to the Triune God.

*Rev. 9: 3. 4. †Eph. 1: 1. 13. 14. ‡Acts 13: 39, Rom. 5: 1, and 8: 1, 1 John 3: 9, and 4: 7, and 5: 1. 4. 18. §Mat. 28: 19. ‖See Mat. 28: 19 in Greek. *(a)* § 6.

13. *By receiving christian baptism, the baptized are recognized as under covenant obligations to obey him in whose name the ordinance is administered to them.* When baptism is administered in the name of the Triune God, obedience is required (*a*). This demand is made in every case when christian baptism is administered. It is so essential to the ordinance, that it is included in the very form of words which Christ requires to be used when it is administered. The justice and propriety of this demand, no believer in Divine revelation can doubt. The unbaptized person is under legal obligations to obey all the demands of the Divine law. Its precepts are "holy, just and good," and therefore ought to be obeyed. But in addition to this, the baptized individual is recognized as being in a state in which he, actually, or virtually and externally, stands bound also in covenant by the reception of this ordinance, to obey the Divine requirements. The duties of the baptized are not increased; but by this ordinance they are more firmly bound to obey; because now they are bound by law as others are to do all that God requires; and they, by being recognized as in a state which admits the propriety of all God's demands, are also bound in covenant to render obedience. Hence by receiving baptism in the name of the Trinity, the baptized are acknowledged as in a covenant state with the christian's God, and therefore recognized as under covenant as well as legal obligations to obey him.

14. *Christian baptism does not change the state of the baptized.* In whatever light this ordinance is viewed, it cannot, by the mere act of receiving it, change the state of the person baptized. If, before his baptism, he is in a sinful and condemned state, he is not delivered from it by this ordinance, but by the converting power of God's Spirit. It is expressly declared that men are "justified by faith"* (*b*). But no passage of God's word contains the least intimation that persons are, by water baptism, justified or delivered from a state of condemnation. If baptism is viewed as a seal of the covenant into which God has entered with his visible people; then it can only be applied to those in this covenant; for it is the property of a seal to confirm the promise

(*a*) § 12. *Rom. 5: 1. (*b*) § 11.

made in the covenant. If the baptized are already "justified by faith," this ordinance does not, cannot reduce them to a state of condemnation. Christian baptism therefore does not change the state of the baptized. It supposes a covenant relation to exist between God and the person to be baptized. The ordinance seals or confirms the promise of this covenant. But it does not change the state of the baptized.

15. *The institution of christian baptism supposes that all the bloody rites were abolished.* The Lord Jesus Christ just before he suffered, "eat" the "passover." At this time therefore, it was, as a religious rite, still in force. As such however it was to cease, when "Christ our passover" was "sacrificed for us." As the passover was an annual* sacrificial feast; it was impossible for it to be again observed before his resurrection, which was to take place on "the third day" after his crucifixion. During this short space of time, the passover could not be eaten by Divine authority. As soon therefore as the last legal passover was observed by him; he instituted the holy supper. But during the time Christ was to suffer on the cross and lie under the power of death in the tomb; it might be necessary, in order to obey the Divine law,† to circumcise children. Circumcision, with the other rites and ceremonies peculiar to Old Testament times, would cease to be binding as religious ordinances, when their whole design was completely accomplished in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.‡ But before his death, it was a positive duty, originating in the Divine command, to observe religiously all these precepts. While therefore these were in force and men might be called upon by the Divine law, to observe them; New Testament ordinances were not instituted; for Christ came not "to destroy the law" in any of its parts, "but to fulfill" it in all its demands.§ Since, while he suffered on the cross and lay in the tomb, children might, by the law, be required to be circumcised; he did not therefore institute the ordinance of christian baptism at the time or before he instituted the Eucharist; for then circumcision was in force. But after his death "the hand-writing" of these "ordinances" being blot-

*Ex. 12: 2. 11: 21. 27, and 13: 10. †Gen. 17: 12. ‡See Col. 2: 14, Eph. 2: 14. 15-22. §Mat. 5: 17.

ted out,* baptism might, with propriety, be instituted. And instituting it thus as a New Testament ordinance, was a public declaration that the rites peculiar to Old Testament times were abolished. But these being abolished, all bloody rites must cease as none of these belong to the New Testament dispensation of the covenant. The institution of baptism therefore supposes that all bloody rites had then ceased to sustain the character of religious ordinances.

16. *Christian baptism is not regeneration.* To generate or beget literally, denotes that natural act which is followed by a natural birth ; or it is the procreation of a natural creature in addition to those already in existence. To *re*generate is to generate or beget again ; or it denotes to re-beget. The same person that is once generated or begotten and is then born into the world, is often said to be *re*generated, *re*begotten or begotten again. That this *re*generating or *re*begetting is not a repetition of the natural act by which he was pro-created, is too manifest to need proof. In the word of God, *re*generation is several times mentioned. To that which it signifies the mind is not unfrequently directed. Persons are said to be "begotten—again;" to be "begotten—through the gospel;" to be begotten "of the Father's will,"—" by the word of truth ;" ministers of the gospel are mentioned in connection with this act as the persons who present the truth to the mind of others ; and those who are regenerated are, as the result of this act, said to be " born again,"—" born—of the Spirit,"—" born of God."† To be regenerated then or to be begotten again, is to have the Spirit of God to operate in such a way upon the person in the act of regenerating him, that he is born of God the Spirit, and thus made a new creature in Christ Jesus. Since regeneration results in the Spiritual birth of a Spiritual creature, it must be a Spiritual act. As natural generation results in the birth of the natural man ; so *re*generation or Spiritual generation results in the Spiritual birth of the new man. Regeneration therefore in its literal import, signifies, (1.) That act of the Spirit of God, which produces, in the regenerated person, a new " nature,"—" a new heart,"—" a new spirit,"—new life, and therefore makes him a " new creature."‡ The

*Col. 2: 11. †1 Pet. 1: 3, 1 Cor. 4: 15, James 1: 18, John 1: 13, and 3: 3. 5, 1 John 3: 9, and 5: 18. ‡Eph. 2: 3, Ezek. 36: 26, John 10: 28, 2 Cor. 5: 17, Gal. 6: 15.

same operation of the Spirit is what truly converts the sinner or turns him away from the love and practice of sin to the love and practice of holiness ; that is, it produces in him a love to the principles and practices required in the word of God, and a desire to turn away from every invention of man, that claims to be a part of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. It also, at the same time, implants in the regenerated person, all the graces and affections of the child of God. It produces in him the principle of faith, of repentance, of love to God, of hatred to sin, and gives him desires after holiness. These are only a specimen of what is done for the sinner who is regenerated by the Spirit of God. (2.) The word of truth is the means usually employed by the Holy Spirit in regenerating sinners. (3.) The ministers of the gospel who preach the word of truth, not those who preach falsehood in the name of the Lord, are usually employed by the Spirit in presenting the truth to the mind of the sinner by which he is truly regenerated. (4.) The truly regenerated receive, believe, love and practice what God in his word teaches ; while they turn aside with a degree of abhorrence from false doctrines and unscriptural practices as parts of their religion. No person truly regenerated by the power of the Holy Spirit, can possibly believe that regeneration is effected by christian baptism, by whomsoever or in what manner soever it may be administered. To say that water applied to the body, in any mode or by any person, regenerates the soul, is a perfect absurdity to the true christian. That the Holy Spirit does not always regenerate the baptized is manifest from the case of Simon the sorcerer; for after "he was baptized," he was still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity."* Every person in christian lands knows, from his own observation, that not a few baptized persons give no scriptural evidence of being regenerated ; for none will say that intoxication, profane swearing, card-playing, and such practices, are scriptural proofs that those who are guilty of them, are the children of God. In these the baptized sometimes engage. This proves that they are not truly regenerated.

This act of the Spirit is called "the washing of regener-

*Acts 8: 13. 23.

ation," (not the washing of baptism;) because by it the sinner is purified from the guilt of his sins. It is called "the renewing of the Holy Ghost;"* because in it, the renewing or sanctifying work of the Spirit, is commenced; and from this point it will continue to increase during the believer's life on earth. And though this renewing work may sometimes be interrupted by an attack of his old master, "sin;" yet its progress on the whole is onward till the christian's mortal career is terminated in death.† To the true christian no truth can be more evident, therefore, than that baptism with water is not regeneration. Nor indeed can an intelligent man whose soul has not been enlightened by the Spirit of God, believe that water applied to the body in baptism, regenerates the soul; unless he has become the mere slave of superstition. Let any intelligent man reflect on the subject untrammeled by superstitious bigotry, and he cannot believe that christian baptism administered by a mere man, is the regenerating act of the Spirit of God upon the soul, by which the sinner is made "a new creature."

17. *Christian baptism is not to be repeated.* Christian baptism cannot be administered without Divine authority. Every attempt to perform a religious act the observance of which, God in his word has not required, is mere mockery. It is a positive violation of that command which directs men to go "to the law and to the testimony"‡ for instruction in all religious duties. It is "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Such "worship" is "vain." It has but a mere "show of wisdom and humility," while it is really rank "will-worship."§ It is an insult upon the wisdom of God. It is not only a practical declaration that his wisdom is defective; but it is also an act by which men declare that their own wisdom is superior to that of God. For if his was perfect wisdom in their estimation, they would not then desire to practice any thing for religion, which, in his word, he had not required. Moreover if they did not fancy themselves to be wiser than God; they would not desire to introduce into his worship that which he had not mentioned as a part of the service which he requires of his creatures. Without Divine authority then baptism could not be adminis-

*Tit. 3: 5. †See Rom. 6: 20. 22. 23, and 7: 24. ‡Isa. 8: 20. §Mat. 15: 9, Col. 2: 23.

tered as a religious ordinance. Without Divine authority therefore it cannot be repeated as a part of true religion. But God has given no authority in his word, either by precept or example, to repeat the ordinance of christian baptism; or in other words to baptize a second time, any person who had already received that ordinance. To attempt to do so then would be an act of mere mockery; a direct insult offered to the God of wisdom. Besides, as the regenerating work of the Spirit on the soul, is an act which christian baptism signifies (*a*) and is not, cannot, in the nature of things, be repeated, so there would therefore be a manifest impropriety in repeating its external sign. It is evident then that christian baptism cannot be repeated without offering a direct insult to the King of the universe.

The expression "repent and do thy first works,"* addressed to the church at Ephesus, does not require its members to be re-baptized. This is manifest from the fact that baptism is not mentioned in the passage or in the connection. Besides, the term works never denotes baptism. It is not the minister, but the members to whom the direction is given. These might be baptized, but they could not administer the ordinance to themselves. These "works" could not therefore have been baptism. They might have been reading or hearing the word, prayer, alms-giving, &c. But no candid believer in the scriptures would ever suppose that baptism was called "works."

18. *Though christian baptism is not, the Lord's Supper is, to be repeated.* In relation to the holy supper, the Spirit of God in addressing professing christians, says to them expressly, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." In this passage of scripture it is stated that christians are "often" to commemorate the death of Christ; till, at his "second" coming, "he shall appear without sin unto salvation."† The Lord's supper then is to be frequently observed by the children of God; while christian baptism is not to be, indeed cannot be, repeated; because for its repetition, God has given no authority; and because an attempt to repeat it is a direct insult offered to God himself.

(*a*) § 9, par. 1. *Rev. 2: 5. †1 Cor. 11: 26, Heb. 9: 28.

CHAPTER II.

DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS; ONE BAPTISM; BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

1. *The doctrine of baptisms is mentioned as one of the first principles of christianity.* A doctrine is a principle taught. All doctrines are either true or false. When truth is taught; the doctrine is true. When falsehood or a mixture of truth and falsehood, is taught; the doctrine is false. "The doctrine of baptisms," is true; because it is mentioned as one of "the first principles of the oracles of God."* A plurality of baptisms are here mentioned. The word "baptisms," in the plural number, clearly teaches this. In this expression more than one baptism is necessarily included. But what baptisms are intended, is not so manifest. These may be, (1.) The ordinance of christian baptism and Spiritual baptism denoting regeneration. These may be intended; as they are among the very first principles of vital godliness in the soul, and of external religion in the life. No true Spiritual religion can exist in the sinner's heart before he is regenerated; nor can he be recognized as a member of the visible church, before he has received the ordinance of christian baptism (*a*). These therefore may be presented as among the very first principles of true religion. This view of the subject is confirmed by the fact that the "laying on of hands" is mentioned in connection with "the doctrine of baptisms." By the laying on of the apostle's hands, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were often communicated to men.† This being an act accompanied by the Holy Spirit and mentioned in connection with the doctrine of baptisms, intimates that one of these baptisms may be Spiritual. It may also be remarked that the ministerial office was also transferred by "laying on"—"the hands of the presbytery."‡ But (2.) this "doctrine of baptisms" may denote what is taught of the different kinds of ceremonial "washings" or baptisms,§ mentioned in the word of God, and especially in the Old Testament (*b*). A number of these baptisms are mentioned. The doctrine or what is taught by these, may with propriety be called "the doctrine of bap-

*Heb. 5: 12, and 6: 2. (*a*) P. iii, Ch. 3, § 8, par. 4. †See Acts 8: 17, and 19: 6. ‡1 Tim. 4: 14. §Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. (*b*) P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1–4, P, ii, Ch. 2, § 1, 2, P. iii, Ch. 1, § 10.

tisms." That all these had ceased to be binding at the death of Christ, and no baptism or ceremonial washing, except the christian ordinance of baptism, was to be in force after that event, was and is, one of the first principles of true religion.

The "doctrine of baptisms," is therefore an expression which may denote (1.) christian and Spiritual baptism, which will continue till the end of time; or, (2.) it may signify those ceremonial washings which ceased at or before the death of Christ; or, (3.) it may include all these; as they are all "first principles of the oracles of God."*

2. *The expression, one baptism, is used by the Holy Spirit.* As the word "baptisms" necessarily includes more than one; so the phrase "one baptism"† necessarily limits the mind to a single baptism. (1.) This expression cannot relate to the baptisms administered before the resurrection of Christ because these were numerous(*a*). This expression (2.) cannot teach the doctrine that there is but one mode of baptism, or that but one person is to be baptized; because the word mode or person is not used in the sentence or in the connection in which the words are used. Nor does any word in the passage of which this phrase is a part, express unity of mode in baptism; or that but one person is to be baptized. The word "*one*" does not express mode or person. If the word "baptism," in the singular number, expresses "one" mode of baptism; then the word "baptisms"‡ in the plural number, must, by the same rule, denote several modes of baptism; for if one baptism signifies one mode of baptism, then ten baptisms must denote ten modes of baptism; because, on that principle, every baptism must denote a mode of baptism. But, as, in the passage, the mode of baptism is not mentioned either directly or indirectly, so those who take the word of God for their only rule of duty, will not be readily induced to mistake for scripture, the addition of the word *mode*, which men, to sustain a favorite system, may please to make to this portion of Divine revelation(*b*). But (3.) the expression "one baptism," teaches that the baptism which is intended, is *one* in its nature; however various the modes of its administration may be. If christian baptism is intended, then the language shows that this ordinance is *one*,

*Heb. 5: 12. †Eph. 4: 5. (*a*) P. ii, Ch. 2, § 2. ‡Heb. 9: 10 in Greek and § 1. (*b*) See Rule No. 4. 5.

whether the mode of its administration be one or various. If spiritual baptism or regeneration is intended; then the phrase "one baptism," shows that the operation of the Spirit on the soul in regeneration, is one act of Almighty power, however various may be the means employed or the modes of this operation. (4.) That this "one" is spiritual "baptism" or regeneration, may be easily learned from the connection in which the words are used. In the context "one body,"—"one Spirit,"—"one hope,"—"one Lord,"—"one faith,"—"one God and Father of all,"* are mentioned. In this connection the attention is directed to seven unities. Six of them are manifestly spiritual. The "one body" is a spiritual, not a literal body; the "Spirit" is the Holy Ghost; the "hope" is an expectation of a spiritual "calling;" the "one Lord" is a spiritual sovereign; the "faith" is a spiritual grace; the "one God" is a spiritual king. As all the other unities mentioned in the connection, are spiritual; so the "one baptism" must be a spiritual ordinance or regeneration, as there is nothing in the language itself or in the connection or in parallel passages of scripture to require or even authorize a different sense to be given to the words in this passage.

3. *Baptism for the dead is mentioned in God's word.* The language used is this; "what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead."† On this passage, it may be remarked, (1.) That baptism for the dead is mentioned as an evidence to prove that a resurrection of the dead shall take place. This is evidently the design of the passage, as is manifest from the language used and from the connection in which it is found. (2.) The expression "baptized for the dead" does not teach that one living person may or must be baptized as a substitute for or in the room of, one or more of the dead. The language used in the passage does not affirm this; nor could the fact that a living person was baptized as a substitute for the dead, be an evidence to prove that the body will be raised to life again after it has mouldered to dust in the tomb. The word *for* in the English language, does not always, or necessarily, or even frequent-

*Eph. 4: 4. 5. 6. †1 Cor. 15: 29.

ly, express substitution ; and when it does, that idea is clearly determined by the connection in which the word is found. The original word (υπερ) in this passage translated *for*, does not literally denote substitution. The connection does not allow this sense to be given to the word ; and no such a signification can be found for it in parallel passages, for no other passage in the word of God so much as mentions baptism for the dead in any form of expression. That this passage of scripture therefore does not teach that a living person may or must be baptized as a substitute for the dead, is manifest, from the language used in the translation and in the original ;—from the fact that such an act could not prove the resurrection of the dead, as this passage does ;—and that to baptize a living person as a substitute for the dead, would be but a mere farce, as it could be of no possible use to the dead or to the living ;—and also that no such sense can be given to the language used, in its literal signification, from the connection or from a reference to parallel passages. Whatever therefore this portion of God's word teaches ; it is evident that it does not authorize or require a living person to be baptized as a substitute for the dead. (3.) If, in the passage, it was stated as a positive fact, that the living were baptized as substitutes for the dead, that would not prove it to be right or authorize others to do so ; because there is not a word in the language or in the connection, or in any other portion of scripture, which could lead a reflecting mind to suppose that God required or approved such an act, or that he commanded, authorized or even permitted others to make it an example for their imitation (*a*). Men have no right to take that for an example which God has not made such. To do so would be substituting their own wisdom for his. It would be forsaking "the fountain of living waters," for their own "broken cisterns."* (4.) The expression "baptized for the dead" may or does teach, that the living who were baptized for the sake of obeying the command of a Saviour who had died and rose again, proved by this act to all to whom it was known, that they had evidence in their own mind sufficiently powerful to convince them that the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead was true. Without

(*a*) P. iii, Ch. 2, § 10. *Jer. 2: 13.

such evidence, clear and conclusive, they would not, in the face of danger and of death, have been baptized in his name. The Greek word (νεκρων) translated "dead," is in the plural number. This form of the word may be the intensitive plural, used to intimate the dignity of Christ, the Person mentioned. (5.) The original word (υπερ) translated *for*, literally signifies *above*.* The expression therefore, "baptized for," or *above* "the dead," may signify that living persons had such clear and undeniable evidence of "the resurrection at the last day,"† that they would willingly receive the ordinance of christian baptism and thus profess their faith in Christ, *over the very dead bodies of those who had received the martyr's crown*, and to whom the iron heart of cruelty had denied the privilege of being laid in the grave. (6.) As the original expression may embrace both these ideas; the Holy Spirit may, by using this language, have intended to leave on the reader's mind, both these impressions. It appears then that the expression "baptized for the dead," does not, cannot signify that the living may or must be baptized as a substitute for the dead; but that it may and does teach the careful reader of God's word, that those who have, for thousands of years, been held in the cold embrace of death, will, at the last day, all spring again into life, by the vivifying power of Almighty God.

PART FIFTH.

BAPTISM WITHOUT WATER.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST.

1. *In the Scriptures, baptism with the Holy Ghost, is taught.* This is proved, (1.) From the fact that this is the very language used by the Holy Spirit on this subject. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost," is the language of the scriptures and it is often repeated; again, it is said of Christ; "He—baptizeth with the Holy Ghost;" and yet again; "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."‡ This language expressly shows that baptism with the Holy Ghost

*See 1 Cor. 15: 29 in Greek. †John 11: 24. ‡Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16, John 1: 33, Acts 1: 5.

is a truth taught in the word of God. (2.) Many synonymous expressions teach the same truth. Some of these may be noticed. One is, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh;" another is, "The Holy Ghost fell on" Cornelius and those with him; another, "On the Gentiles—was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost;" and yet another is, "The Holy Ghost came on"* those who were re-baptized by the direction of Paul. Other instances might be mentioned; but these are sufficient to show those who will take the language of scripture for proof, that baptism with the Holy Spirit is positively taught in the word of God.

2. *Baptism with the Holy Ghost is extraordinary and ordinary.* It is (1.) Extraordinary or miraculous. In the case of the Apostles the miraculous power which it expressed, was of a peculiar kind. When they were first sent to preach to the Jews only; they were empowered to work miracles.† Our Saviour after his resurrection directed the eleven to "tarry—in the city of Jerusalem, until" they should "be endued with power from on high."‡ A short time before he ascended to Heaven, he said to them; "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."§ About ten days after this, they were enabled miraculously, to speak sixteen or seventeen different languages or dialects. This took place on "the day of Pentecost." Then they were "baptized with the Holy Ghost,"—"the Holy Ghost" came "upon" them, or was poured "out" on them.‖ In their case therefore to be "baptized with the Holy Ghost," was to have the gift of speaking different languages conferred on them by the supernatural power of the Spirit of God. Others also upon whom the Holy Ghost "was poured out"—spoke "with tongues."¶ It appears therefore that to be baptized miraculously with the Holy Ghost, is to be supernaturally enabled to speak different languages. (2.) Baptism with the Holy Ghost may denote the ordinary regenerating power of the Spirit, by which a sinner is made a new creature. This appears to be at least included in the declaration made on this subject by John to those whom he baptized. He said to them as a body; "he shall baptize you

*Joel 2: 28, Acts 2: 17, and 10: 44. 45, and 19: 6. †See Mat. 10: 8, Luke 9: 1. 2. 6. ‡Luke 24: 49. §Acts 1: 4. 5. 8. ‖Acts 1: 5. 8, and 2: 1–17. ¶Acts 10: 45. 46, and 11: 15–17.

with the Holy Ghost."* The word of God affords no evidence that most, or even a considerable number, of those whom John baptized, were enabled to work miracles or to speak with tongues. But, as, in the expression, "all the people—justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John,"† we find proof that many of them experienced the regenerating grace of God; so it is evident that in the case of many of them, to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, was to be regenerated by the power of the Spirit of God. By being baptized with this spiritual baptism, they were made heirs of God; but were not enabled to work miracles or to speak with new tongues. This kind of spiritual baptism is experienced by every true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ; while miraculous powers were confined to but few and these not all known as the children of God.‡ From these remarks it may be easily concluded that baptism with the Holy Ghost is both extraordinary or miraculous, and ordinary, such as all true christians experience when they are actually adopted into the family of God.

3. *Jesus Christ baptized with the Holy Ghost.* Speaking of him to the Jews, John the Baptist positively and repeatedly declares "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."* From this and similar language it is undeniably certain, that to baptize with the Spirit, is not the work of mere man, but of the Divine Redeemer. The converting, as well as the miraculous work of the Holy Ghost, was therefore a part of what the Great Shepherd purchased for his sheep.§ To some whom he baptized with the Holy Ghost, he gave miraculous powers; to others he gave only converting grace, sanctifying power and eternal glory, with whatever is necessary to make an enemy of God his true friend.

4. *Upon those baptized with the Spirit, he, in his influences, descended.* Of such, it is said; the Spirit was poured "out" or "fell on them."‖ This, with much similar language which is used in relation to baptism with the Holy Ghost, shows that when persons were thus baptized, the influences of the Spirit descended or came upon them. This is manifest. Indeed, nothing can be more evident than, that

*Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16. †Luke 7: 29. ‡See Mat. 7: 22. 23, and 12: 17, 2 Thess. 2: 9. 10, Deut. 13: 1–5, Num. 24: 17–19 compared with 2 Pet. 2: 15. 16. §See 1 Cor. 6: 20, and 7: 23, John 10: 11; 14. 17. 18. ‖See Acts 2: 17, and 10: 44. 45 and 11: 15.

when the Spirit is "poured out" on men and falls on them or enters them so that they are "filled"* with it, they are not, at the same time, put all over into the Spirit. From the language of God's word then it is manifest that the Spirit in his influences descends or comes upon those who are baptized with the Holy Ghost.*(a)*.

5. *When the Apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost, there was an external appearance.* This was that of "cloven tongues like as of fire." It "sat upon each of them."† The word *it* stands for the fire, or rather the fiery appearance which remained for a time on each of the disciples. The appearance of "cloven tongues" resembling fire, resting on each of them, as the Holy Ghost was baptizing them, may indicate that then each of them was about to be enabled to speak with new tongues. These were "cloven" or divided. This might indicate to them that they were soon to be sent to different parts of the then known world to use their miraculously acquired power of speaking different languages, in publishing the gospel of salvation. But whatever might have been the design of God in causing this visible appearance at the time the Holy Ghost was baptizing them; the fact that such an appearance existed, is certain.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM WITH FIRE.

1. *Baptism with fire is taught in the word of God.* The language of scripture on this subject is very definite. Baptism "with fire"‡ is twice explicitly mentioned. The fact that baptism "with fire" is taught in the word of God, must then be manifest to every person who will read its language.

2. *Jesus Christ baptizes with fire.* Of him it is said to the Jews; "He shall baptize you—with fire."‡ That the Lord Jesus Christ baptizes with fire is here taught in language too plain to be disputed by any who can believe the evidence of their senses.

3. *To baptize with fire is forcible language.* Literal fire either purifies or consumes material substances. To baptize with fire then may indicate that those who receive this

*Acts 2: 4, and 10: 47. *(a)* § 2. †Acts 2: 3. ‡Mat. 3: 11, Luke 3: 16.

baptism, are either by it to be purified or consumed. Christ baptizes his people with fire, when he purifies them "in the furnace of affliction;"* or when he sanctifies them by the operations of his Spirit in their souls;† or when he uses both these for the purpose of making them more and more holy. When both are used for this purpose, afflictions are the means, and the Spirit the efficient operator by which the means are made effectual in sanctifying the soul. He baptizes his enemies with fire when he sends upon them fearful temporal calamities, or the horrors of an awakened or of a seared conscience; and especially when he consigns their immortal souls to the gnawings of the "worm" that never dies, and to the dark dismal flames of that fire which shall not be "quenched."‡

4. *This baptism usually manifests itself by its effects.* That afflictions are generally manifested by their effects, all can perceive. When baptism with fire denotes sanctification; it manifests itself by leading those who enjoy its purifying influence to become more and more conformed to the word of God, in principle and in practice. When "God," to the sinner out of Christ becomes "a consuming fire,"§ his hardened heart, his seared conscience, his careless rebellion against Heaven, his adoption of unscriptural principles and practices for religion, his hatred of Divine truth, proclaim the fact to all who will hear; and in the world of woe, his "weeping"—and "wailing" and "gnashing of teeth"‖ cannot be concealed. It will be evident therefore to the observing mind that baptism with fire is usually, if not universally, manifested in its external effects.

CHAPTER III.

BAPTISM WITH SUFFERINGS.

1. *This baptism is taught in the scriptures.* Our Saviour after describing his sufferings and death by crucifixion, calls them "the cup that" he should "drink of," and "the baptism that" he, at that time, was, and was soon more man-

*Isa. 48: 10. †See Ex. 31: 13, Rom. 15: 16, 1 Thes. 5: 23. ‡See Isa. 66: 24, Jude:13, Mark 9: 43-48. §Heb. 12: 29. ‖Mat. 8: 12, and 13: 42. 50, and 22: 13, and 24: 51, and 25: 30, Luke 13: 28.

ifestly, to be "baptized with."* In addressing James and John, he says; "Are ye able—to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" This shows that at the very time he was speaking, he was receiving this baptism; and that at that time it was not yet completed, appears when he says of it; "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?"† That baptism which, when he addressed James and John, he was actually receiving, and which was not then completed, could be no other than the baptism of suffering. It could not be that which John the Baptist administered; because that was completed long before this time. It is therefore evident that the baptism mentioned in these portions of God's word, is baptism with sufferings.

2. *Jesus Christ received this baptism.* He declares expressly "I am baptized with" this baptism; and "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?"‡ This he says in relation to his baptism with sufferings (*a*).

3. *The Apostles, James and John, were to be, and were baptized with sufferings.* That they were to be thus baptized is positively stated. Christ said to them; "Ye shall—be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with."§ That they were thus baptized, is certain; for Herod killed "James—with the sword;" and "John—was" banished to "the isle" of "Patmos for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."‖ These two disciples then received the baptism of sufferings according to Christ's prediction.

4. *The martyrs were baptized with sufferings.* Many of these have suffered death with "fire, with the sword," with various kinds of torture, with scourging, with "imprisonment," with being "sawn asunder," with wandering "in deserts,—in mountains and in dens and caves of the earth."¶ More than fifty millions of the professed followers of the Lord Jesus Christ have suffered death by the unrelenting hand of persecution. These, like their blessed Master, were severely baptized with sufferings.

5. *All true christians receive this baptism in a greater or less degree.* Jesus Christ says to all his disciples; "In the

*Mat. 20: 17–22, Mark 10: 32–38. †Luke 12: 50. ‡Mat. 20: 22, Mark 10: 38, Luke 12: 50. (*a*) § 1. §Mat. 20: 23, Mark 10: 39. ‖Acts 12: 2, Rev. 1: 9. ¶Heb. 11: 34–38.

world ye shall have tribulation ;" and again, the same truth is stated in this language ; "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution."* All such persons shall be baptized with suffering. The distress of some will be exceedingly great ; that of others only like a drop from the ocean. But as a general rule, the more holy and devoted the christian is, the more persecution he will in this life be called to endure. The more he conforms to the word of God in principle and in practice,—the more he resembles in heart and life the great Redeemer ; the more will the enemies of God hate and persecute him. Those who profess to be christians, while they hate God and the truths of his word, will generally be most bitter and unprincipled in their persecuting attacks upon his children. Indeed, persecutors may be so blinded with sin that, while they are killing the disciples of Christ, they may imagine, they are doing "God service?"† But all true christians must expect to "suffer persecution." In whatever way their enemies persecute them, or by whatever means they may attempt to justify their wickedness ; one truth is undeniably certain ; all who, in this life, truly love God, will find the world a "vale of tears." They will all be baptized with sufferings.

PART SIXTH.

BAPTISM WITHOUT DIVINE AUTHORITY.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM WITHOUT DIVINE AUTHORITY BEFORE CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

1. *The ordinary self-baptism of the Jews was unauthorized by Divine wisdom.* The fact that they did frequently baptize themselves, is positively stated in this language ; "when they come from the market, except they wash" or (βαπτισωνται) baptize, as it is expressed in the original, "they eat not." In the practice of these their ceremonial washings or baptisms ; our Saviour charges them with laying "aside the commandment of God" and observing "the tradition of men."‡ Moreover, it is said on a certain occasion, that a Pharisee "marvelled" because the blessed Redeemer "sat

*John 16: 33, 2 Tim. 3: 12. †John 16: 2. ‡Mark 7: 4. 8 in Greek.

down to meat" before "he had—first washed,"* or(εβαπτισθη) baptized. The fact that the Pharisee "marvelled" because Christ did not wash or baptize before dinner, shows that the custom of doing so, was very general if not universal among the Jews; and the fact that he did not wash or baptize before he "sat down," proves that such ceremonial washings were not of Divine appointment. The Lord Jesus Christ therefore, both in words and actions condemns those washings or baptisms which the Jews practiced without Divine authority.

2. *The baptism by the Jews of various domestic articles was not required by the law of God.* When they, under the direction of the Pharisees, turned aside from the Divine rule laid down in the scriptures; they received from them various traditions. Among these they had adopted, as a religious rite, "the washing" or (βαπτισμους) baptizing "of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables," or (κλινων) couches.† Though some of these, under certain circumstances, might, by the Divine law, be ceremonially purified with "water" (*a*).‡ Yet the Jews had no authority to wash or baptize them when they returned from market. Our Saviour therefore charges them with laying "aside the commandment of God" and adopting "the tradition of men,"† when they baptized or ceremonially washed these articles without Divine authority. In relation to these and "many other such like things," which they had invented and practiced as portions of religious service, our Saviour says; "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."§ The washing or baptizing of these domestic articles was a mere act of will-worship. It was in fact an insult offered to the God of wisdom; as are all human inventions introduced into religious worship

3. *God did not authorize the Jews to baptize proselytes.* The fact that they did baptize them is not explicitly stated in the word of God. Indeed, concerning their baptism, nothing is said in the scriptures. The copy of Josephus examined on this subject, does not intimate that the Jews baptized proselytes. But notwithstanding this, the fact that they did baptize, as well as circumcise, proselytes, is sus-

*Luke 11: 37. 38 in Greek. †Mark 7: 4. in Greek. (*a*) P. ii, Ch. 2, § 3. ‡Lev. 6: 28, and 11: 32, and 15: 12. §Mark 7: 8, Mat. 15: 9.

tained by unanswerable evidence (*a*). That they had no Divine authority for doing so, is manifest, (1.) From the fact that, in the word of God, no authority is given for such a practice. (2.) This practice may be condemned in the expression of disapprobation used by our Saviour to the Jews, when he says ; they had "many other" unauthorized washings or baptisms, besides those which he had definitely mentioned.* (3.) The passage of scripture upon the authority of which they profess to act when they baptize proselytes, does not so much as mention or even allude to the baptism of persons with water. The passage is this ; "And the Lord said unto Moses, go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes."† (4.) This direction was given more than four hundred years after circumcision was instituted. It could not therefore have with it, any necessary connection. (5.) But if it had, the language does not express baptism with water. To sanctify does not necessarily denote to apply water to the person in baptism : to "wash"—"clothes" does not signify to baptize or wash the person. (6.) Besides, this direction is given to the Jews themselves on a particular occasion and for a particular purpose. It was not an established ordinance for perpetual observance even among the Jews, much less was it applicable to the Gentiles who might desire to embrace the religion of Israel ; and least of all, did it require these last to be baptized as well as circumcised when they were received by the Jews as proselytes to their religion. The baptism therefore of proselytes by the Jews was unauthorized by Divine wisdom.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM WITHOUT DIVINE AUTHORITY AFTER CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

1. *Baptism administered by laymen is without Divine authority.* Sometimes mere laymen or those who do not sustain the office of christian ministers, perform the act of bap-

(*a*) See Ter. on Bap. c. 5; Cyp. Epistle 73 to Jabianus, Greg. Naz. Orat. 39, Basil Orat. on Bap. Mish. and Gama. of the Jeru. and Bab. Talm. Rab. Sol. on Ex. 19: 10, Maimonides, Clarke, Lightfoot, Seldon, Hammond, Wall, Henry, on Mark 1: 1–8, Claude, Fleury, &c. *Mark 7: 4, †Ex. 19: 10.

tizing persons. This is only a solemn farce. The Lord Jesus Christ gives to his ministering servants, and to no others, the authority to administer baptism.* None but such can therefore administer this holy ordinance. For others to attempt to administer it, is solemn mockery, is practical blasphemy, since by such an act, a man assumes the prerogatives of a Divine person, for he acts in this matter as if he were independent of God.

2. *Females have no Divine authority to administer baptism.* Among Romanists, females, under certain circumstances, are allowed, if not required, by their regulations, to administer baptism. But the word of God does not give them any such authority. In giving the New Testament commission to his disciples and to their successors in the ministerial office, by which they were empowered to preach the gospel and administer the christian sacraments, Jesus Christ did not authorize females to baptize. The apostles and their official successors were not directed to transmit this office to females, but to "faithful men who" should "be able to teach others."† Since therefore, in the scriptures, females have no authority given them to preach or baptize; whenever they attempt to do either, they are engaged in practical rebellion against God.

3. *Christian baptism cannot be administered except in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.* The Sabians of Syria, some Arians and a few others, apply water in what they call baptism, without using the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. These Sabians, or "Daily Baptists," as they call themselves, use a form in their baptismal ceremony which, when translated, reads thus; "*I baptize thee with the baptism with which John the Baptist baptized*" (*a*). They call this ceremony "the baptism of Light." Some Arians apply water simply in the name of God, without using the name of the Trinity. Some others, it is understood, use this or a similar form; "I baptize, or I immerse thee in or into the church of Christ." All baptisms administered by using these or any similar forms of human invention, are totally destitute of Divine authority; as such forms are not mentioned in the scriptures. Besides, when Christ com-

*See Mat. 28: 19. †See Mat. 28: 19, 2 Tim. 2: 2. 24. (*a*) See Micha. on N. T. vol. III. Pt. 1, Taylor, pages 84. 85.

mands his disciples to baptize, he directs them to use a different form. It may also be observed, that in some portions of the Greek church, what they call baptism is administered, not by a minister, but by the god-father of the baptized, without using any form of words (*a*).

To attempt to administer baptism without Divine authority, is treating the Great Head of the church with contempt. It is, by those who do so, a practical declaration that they have as good authority as he had, to say who may baptize, and what form is to be used; and by practicing on their own plan, they declare it to be superior to his. The sin of such a system must be great in the sight of the King of Zion. Can a true christian be guilty of thus habitually insulting his crucified Redeemer?

PART SEVENTH.

MODES OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE VARIOUS MODES OF BAPTISM MENTIONED.

1. *The word mode ought to be understood.* The mode of doing a thing denotes the particular manner in which it is performed. It is evident to any reflecting mind that the same thing may be performed in a variety of different ways or modes. A man may be killed with a dirk, with a pistol, with poison or with a sword. The same crime may be perpetrated in these and a thousand other modes. Indeed the mode or manner of performing an action, whether in the discharge of a duty or in the commission of a crime, is never essential to the action, unless the command requiring or forbidding its performance, specifies or includes the mode. The command, "thou shalt not kill," prohibits murder in what mode soever it may be perpetrated. But the command, "thou shalt not kill" with a dirk, forbids the crime to be committed in one particular mode and in no other. If God commands an action to be done or a duty to be performed, without specifying in what mode or manner it is to be done,

(*a*) See Hist. of the Georgian and Mingrelian churches, Rel. Cer. and Cus. p. 221.

then it is manifest that the action or duty may be attended to in any mode. But if God requires a duty to be performed in a particular manner and in no other, then attempting to perform it in any other mode is simply rebellion against his command. If he requires a duty to be performed, and does not specify the mode, men have no right to do so. If the mode or manner of doing an action is, by Divine authority, made essential to the performance of it; then to attempt to do it in any other way, is an insult upon the wisdom of God. It is a virtual attempt to correct Omniscience. If God has required baptism to be administered in one particular mode and in no other; then he has mentioned this in his word in definite language. If he has not so mentioned it. then we know that he makes no such requirement of his creatures. To say that God teaches men to baptize in a particular mode of which he says nothing, is to affirm that he teaches what he does not teach; or in other words; to make such a statement would be to utter a positive untruth. It is certain then that in investigating the subject of baptism, the term *mode* ought to be understood.

2. *To sprinkle is an expression easily understood.* It signifies to cause a fluid to fall in drops. When it is used to denote the application of water in connection with baptism; it signifies to cause water to fall in drops on the forehead or upper part of the face, of the person to whom the element is applied. But to sprinkle is an expression too plain to need farther illustration.

3. *Water is sometimes poured upon persons for baptism. To pour* signifies to cause a small quantity of a fluid to flow down upon some object. A person is said to *be poured* in baptism, when a small quantity of water is poured on his head in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the word of God, to *pour* signifies to fall in drops as a shower of rain descends. When it is said; "the clouds poured out water;"* the expression shows that a shower of rain fell in drops. In the scripture sense of the word therefore, pour does not materially differ in its meaning from the word sprinkle. They both denote to fall in drops.

4. *Men often say that immersion is baptism.* When it is

*Ps. 77: 17.

used as a substitute for baptism, it expresses a very complex action. With those who immerse adults and no others; the action which they express by it, is eight-fold. In immersion, after adjusting their dress, they (1.) repair to some river, pond, brook or cistern; (2.) the person to be immersed wades into the water nearly or quite up to the waist; (3.) the administrator takes both the hands of the person to be immersed into one of his and places the other between the shoulders of the subject who, at this stage of the operation, sometimes stands and sometimes kneels; but when he kneels he generally chooses more shallow water than when he stands; (4.) the administrator puts that portion of the person which is yet above water, entirely under its surface, by laying him down on his face or on his back, so that the external garments of the person, if he is dressed, is usually for a moment under the water; (5.) he immediately raises the person up again; (6.) the subject wades out of the water; (7.) he then leaves the stream, pond, or cistern; (8.) he changes his dress, substituting dry for wet garments; unless he had performed the operation in a state of nudity. When immersion is practiced for baptism, two of these actions are always and necessarily included in the signification of the word. These are the fourth and fifth. The parts of the body which are yet above, are, by the administrator, put entirely under the surface of the water, and then immediately raised up again. When a person is immersed, the body must be entirely under water. If he was left in this state, the action certainly would not be complete. If he was left entirely under water, his natural life must, in a very few minutes, be destroyed. Few, even of those most in favor of a "watery grave," would be willing to remain many minutes totally covered with water. If they were thus left; indeed, if they were not very soon raised from beneath the surface of that element; nothing but a miracle could save them from almost instant death. As therefore to put a person entirely under water and leave him there, would be one mode of killing him; no immerser who is not in favor of destroying life, will affirm that the whole action of immersion as a substitute for baptism, ends when the person is completely covered with water. To be immersed therefore

for baptism, is to be put entirely under water and taken out again; a part at least of which acts must be performed by the administrator.

Those who immerse infants exclusively or nearly so(*a*), besides a great variety of ridiculous ceremonies, usually put the child entirely under water. The fluid is usually warmed a little. The child is frequently put under the water by a minister. It is thus immersed three times. He sometimes uses the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost and sometimes he does not. Indeed sometimes the god-father of the infant immerses it three times without using any form of words whatever(*a*).

Some immersers immerse only a part of their communicants. Some do not view immersion as the only mode of baptism and some do. Some of them will admit unbaptized persons to partake with them of the Lord's Supper. Some will, and some will not, immerse infants. Some put on an over-dress when they are immersed, lest their bodies should be entirely wet with water. But in western Europe and in America, immersers usually immerse adults only. These, while in the operation, are in modern times, generally, if not universally, dressed in some kind of garments.

For a person to be entirely covered with air, or fog, or smoke, or sand, is not to be immersed. If that were the case, then every person is constantly immersed; as each individual of the human race, is, while living, entirely covered with air, and often with smoke and fog. If a person should be entirely covered with sand; not many immersers would suppose that he, on that account, was properly baptized. It is undeniable, then that to be immersed is to be covered entirely with water, and not with any other material.

It generally appears like a voluntary act on the part of the immersed when they are grown to years of manhood. But it seldom is so in reality; because very few of them examine the subject and compare it with the word of God before they are immersed. They therefore act under the guidance of those to whom they submit themselves as their leaders. If they ever examine the scriptures in relation to the

(*a*) See Rel. Cer. and Cus. Art. Greek Church p. 182. 211. 221. 233. 237, 242, Hartford Ed. 1836.

matter; it is to find something to justify them in what they have already done; not to ascertain what God the Lord teaches them to do.

CHAPTER II.

THE POINT TO BE EXAMINED STATED.

1. *It is important to know the point in dispute.* If this is not known and definitely fixed, the mind is in constant danger of wandering from it, or of being led away from it by those who have more cunning than honesty. But when the point to be examined is clearly perceived and well understood; then the connection of an argument with it will be perceived; and the fallacy of sophistry will more readily be discovered. Truth never shuns the point; falsehood always does. If a position is true, the more evident it is, the brighter it will shine; and if it is false, the more easily will it be detected by having the point clearly stated. It is then, in all subjects of dispute, a matter of great importance to have a clear view of the exact point to be examined. Without this, little can be done to ascertain the validity of the claims of immersion to be the only mode of baptism.

2. *What the point is not, deserves attention.* The point to be decided is, not (1.) Whether baptism with water is or is not a duty. That it is, both parties admit; (2.) Not whether immersion is a mode of baptism or not; (3.) Not whether immersion or another mode is more or less convenient; (4.) Not whether it is more or less desirable or solemn than another mode; (5.) Not whether it is or is not a cross; (6.) Not whether it is shame or pride or fear or the influence of others, that leads persons to choose or refuse to be immersed; (7.) Not whether many or few adopt this or another mode; (8.) Not whether men sanction or disapprove one mode of baptism or another; (9.) Not whether immersers are good men or bad; wise or unwise. Whether these matters are important or otherwise, they form in fact no part of the subject of discussion between those who do, and those who do not, maintain that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

3. *The point to be settled is this.* Is immersion the only mode of baptism? Men often declare that immersion and that only is baptism. They say that it is so essential to the ordinance, that without it, baptism cannot exist; and that those and those only who are immersed are baptized. The evidence in favor of this exclusive claim, is the point to be investigated.

4. *This point has two parts.* The position laid down by the exclusives on this subject, is, that immersion is the only mode of baptism; or in other language, they say, that immersion and that only is baptism. When it is said that immersion is the only mode of baptism, a twofold declaration is made. It is affirmed, (1.) That immersion is baptism or *a mode* of baptism; and (2.) That it is *the only mode* of baptism; or that immersion and nothing else, is baptism. Both these ideas are manifestly included in the assertion that immersion is the only mode of baptism; because, as the same thing may be done in different ways or modes (*a*), so baptism may be performed in different modes unless God requires it to be administered in some one particular mode and in no other. In the examination therefore of this subject, it is necessary, (1.) To see whether the word of God definitely teaches that immersion is *a mode of baptism;* and (2.) See whether it informs us that immersion is *the only mode* in which that ordinance can be administered. If either or both these positions are true, then we have definite evidence to sustain such truth in the word of God.

5. *Exclusive claims must be sustained by positive evidence.* When a man affirms that immersion is the only mode of baptism; to prove his statement he ought to show at least one passage of scripture which positively states that immersion is baptism; or he ought to show a passage which declares that some one person was baptized by immersion. He should then point to a portion of God's word, which states that immersion is the only mode of baptism; or that there is no other mode or only one mode of baptism. If he fails to do this; his exclusive claim stands unsupported by proper evidence. It is a mere proofless assertion. He who makes exclusive claims, must not expect, among persons of reflection, to sus-

(*a*) Ch. 1, § 1.

tain them by positive assertions or by asking questions. He must expect that persons of sense, will call upon him to present plain, positive, pointed evidence to sustain his dogmatical assertions; and if he is unable to do this; he must not be surprized if he finds himself ranked among mere demagogues. To suppose that an exclusive claim may be sustained without positive testimony, is an insult offered to the good common sense of mankind. When a man makes a positive assertion of any kind; it is but right that he should sustain it by proper evidence; much more should this be demanded of him who makes an exclusive claim. Those therefore who affirm that immersion is the only mode of baptism, ought to have something more than an assertion and a question to prove their position. They must bring a "thus saith the Lord" for it, if they would fairly convince intelligent men that their claim is supported by the word of God. When a man makes a positive assertion which includes an exclusive claim, and then undertakes to sustain it by conjecture or saying, it may be so, or there is no proof of something else, or by saying it must be so, or by asking why such a thing was done if it was not so; he either knows very little concerning the nature of evidence or supposes his hearers know but little on that subject. In a word, such a step would seem to intimate that he had either very little knowledge or very little honesty.

BOOK SECOND—IMMERSION EXAMINED.

PART FIRST.

IMMERSION SOUGHT FROM THE WORD OF GOD.

CHAPTER I.

IN THE SCRIPTURES PERSONS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE IMMERSED.

1. *God, in his word, does not command persons to be immersed.* In no portion of the scriptures is it said to any person, for any purpose; Be immersed; or ye shall be immersed; or thou shalt be immersed. There is therefore no command in the word of God given in any form of language,

requiring any person to be immersed for any purpose whatever.

2. *God does not require any person to immerse others.* He does not direct any of his ministering servants or any individual of the human race, to immerse others. He does not, in any passage of his word, say to any ; go ye and immerse ; nor does he in any form of words command them to immerse any one person or more. No person can find in God's word any such direction ; for this plain reason ; none such is recorded in that Holy book. God, therefore, does not in his word, command any person to immerse others.

3. *God does not direct persons to be baptized by immersion or to baptize others in this mode.* New Testament ministers are commanded to "Go—and teach all nations, baptizing them."* But they are not told to administer this ordinance by immersion. In no portion of the book of God, are men directed or authorized by any requirement, to baptize by immersion. Persons are commanded to be "baptized,"† but not a word is said in such directions to them concerning the mode in which baptism is to be administered. Nor are they in any other passage directed to be baptized by immersion.

4. *No person speaking of himself or others, is, in the scriptures, represented as saying I or they immerse or baptize or were baptized by immersion.* John said, "I baptize ;"—and Paul, "I baptized ;"—and another sacred writer ; "men and women" were baptized.‡ But no person mentioned in the word of God, says; I immerse or I immersed or they immersed, or that any individual baptized or was baptized by immersion.

5. *The word immerse is not found in the word of God.* Any person can determine this matter for himself by reading the scriptures. He will not find the very word immerse itself in any part of Divine revelation. It is not so much as mentioned by any sacred writer, either in the Old or New Testament. It is not used in God's word for baptism or for any other purpose. So far therefore are men from being required, by Divine authority, to be immersed or to immerse others, that the word immerse itself is not once used for any purpose whatever, in any part of the scriptures of truth.

6. *In the original scriptures, men are not commanded to*

*Mat. 28: 19. †Acts 2: 38, and 22: 16. ‡Mat. 3: 11, 1 Cor. 1: 14. 16, Acts 8: 12.

immerse or to be immersed for baptism or to be baptized by immersion. In the Greek language there are two words (εμβαπτω and εμβαπτιζω) which frequently but not always signify to put the thing mentioned entirely under water or under something else. Neither of these is the very word immerse itself; nor is either of them, at any time, used in the original spriptures to denote baptism. Indeed, only one of them (εμβαπτω) is used by the Spirit of God for any purpose whatever; but that one is not at any time or in any passage in the Greek Testament, used to signify baptism.* If God had intended to teach the world that immersion is baptism or the only mode of baptism; he would certainly for this purpose have used, at least once, one of the words which sometimes signify to immerse or to put entirely under water. In the original Hebrew of the Old Testament, no word is used for baptism, which denotes immerse. If the King of kings had intended to inform the world that immersion is the only mode of baptism; it is strange, passing strange, that he has not told men so in a single passage in his own holy book!! It is truly astonishing that men should be called upon to believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism, when the word immerse is not used so much as once in the whole word of God, for baptism, or in English for any other purpose! and when neither of the original words which sometimes denote immerse is, at any time, used in Scripture for baptize. If the word immerse was ever employed in the scriptures for any purpose resembling baptism; men might fancy that in such an instance the word denoted baptism.— But how can they imagine that the word is recorded in the book of God and that it denotes baptism! And then to crown the imaginary climax, they appear to fancy that they can make people of sense believe that immersion is not merely a mode, but that it is the only mode of baptism. Is it possible for a man to believe, that God commands him to be immersed or to immerse others, when the scriptures do not so much as mention immersion as a mode of administering that ordinance? If he can, he can believe that God commands what is not so much as once mentioned as baptism in the whole of Divine revelation.

*See Mat. 26: 23, Mark 14: 20, John 13: 26, in Greek.

7. *God, in his word, does not say that baptize signifies immerse.* Any person by reading that holy book can easily perceive, that God therein does not say, that the word baptize always denotes immerse. He does not say that to immerse is its radical meaning; nor does he so much as intimate that it is ever used in that sense. Not even a suggestion of this kind, is found in the whole word of God. By explaining the word therefore, God does not teach that baptize always or ever denotes immerse. Had he chosen, he could have so defined the word baptize. His wisdom could have discovered an expression by which it might have been explained, if none such had existed among men. But words did then exist in the Greek language, by which mankind might have been taught that baptize meant immerse, if that was in truth its signification. Either of the two words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω)which in Greek frequently signify to immerse, might have been used as a substitute for or to define the word baptize. If either or both these words had at any time been used by Divine inspiration, for baptism, or to define that word; probable evidence would have thus been furnished to prove that immersion is one mode of baptism. But neither of them is ever used in the word of God, either as a substitute for or to explain the word baptize. The word (εμβαπτω) is used three times in the Greek Testament; but in not one of them does it denote baptism; and it is by no means certain, that in any of them it denotes immerse.*—God therefore in his word does not teach mankind, that immerse is the only meaning, or the radical meaning, or any meaning of the word baptize. To affirm that this is its meaning, is, therefore *to make an assertion unsupported by the language* of inspiration. It is to turn aside from the Divine instruction of God's word.

8. *In no passage of Scripture does the word baptism evidently signify immerse.* In the English New Testament, the word baptize, in its various modifications, is used eighty-nine times; and in the Greek Testament the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize in its different forms, is found in ninety-three places. In some of its forms, it is translated into English by the words "wash"—"washing"—"washed," and

*See Mat. 26: 23, Mark 14: 20, John 13: 26 in Greek.

"washings."* But in no one of these ninety-three passages, does the connection evidently show that immersion is necessarily the meaning of the word baptize. To give it a different sense will not, in any place where it is used, destroy or injure the meaning of the passage. If it be said that John baptized at the Jordan by sprinkling, the sense is as strictly correct, as if it were said; he baptized in Jordan by immersion. When "Philip and the Eunuch" both went down *to, towards* or "*into* the water, and he baptized him;" the sense is at least as good, if we say he baptized him by sprinkling, as if we say, he baptized him by immersion. When Christ was baptized; he did not come from under but *from* or "*out of the water*" into which he might have stepped a few inches.† It is therefore manifest that the word baptize does not necessarily or even evidently denote immerse in these passages; and these are the only passages where any person would think of finding that immersion was necessarily or clearly the meaning of the word baptize.

CHAPTER II.

NO EXAMPLE OF IMMERSION RECORDED IN SCRIPTURE.

1. *God in his word does not say that any person was immersed.* It is said of Christ and of the Eunuch and of Paul and of others; they were "baptized;"‡ but of not one person, is it said, in the whole book of God; he was immersed.

2. *No one named in the word of God says of himself that he was immersed.* In the scriptures, persons are often mentioned as speaking of themselves. But in no instance are we told in the word of God; that any person good or bad, declares of himself, I was immersed, or I am about to be immersed, or I will be immersed, or God requires me to be immersed. No one individual mentioned in scripture, wise or unwise, Christian, Jew or Heathen, pretends to present himself as an example of immersion.

3. *The original Scriptures do not present any example of immersion for baptism.* No word denoting immerse is used for baptism in the original scriptures. Neither of the two

*Mark 7: 4, Luke 11: 38, Heb. 9: 10, in Greek and English. †See Mat. 3: 6, 16, Acts 8: 38, in Greek. ‡Mat. 3: 16, Acts 8: 38, and 9: 18.

words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) which in Greek sometimes denote immerse, is used of any person to express his baptism. The former of these words (εμβαπτω) is the one used in the Greek New Testament. It is employed by our Saviour when he says; "He that dippeth" (εμβαψας) "his hand with me in the dish shall betray me." "It is one of the twelve, that dippeth" (εμβαπτομενος) "with me in the dish;"— "When he had dipped" (εμβαψας) "the sop, he gave it to Judas."* No person, in any of these expressions, is mentioned as being baptized. Since no word which definitely expresses immersion, is used in scripture to denote any person's baptism; it is evident that the word of God contains no definite example of any person being baptized by immersion.— And without positive precept (*a*) or example in the word of God to sustain the position, *men* are called upon to believe that immersion and that only, is baptism!! What an unblushing demand!!!

4. *No person mentioned in Divine revelation intimates that he immersed others or that he baptized any one by immersion.* It is often stated that persons baptized others. John "baptized" the Lord Jesus Christ; Paul baptized "Crispus and Gaius;" Philip "baptized" the Eunuch;† and many other examples of baptism being administered, are mentioned in the Divine word. But not an instance is mentioned of one person immersing another for baptism or for any other purpose whatever. Moreover, it is not stated in a single passage of God's word, that any person baptized another by immersion; or that the word baptize ever signifies immerse. There is therefore no example of immersion for baptism mentioned in the whole word of God.

CHAPTER III.

IMMERSION NOT INFERENTIALLY TAUGHT IN THE WORD OF GOD.

1. *What is intended by an inference or inferential evidence may be properly noticed here.* An inference is not a mere assertion; nor is it taking for granted the point to be proved; nor yet is it an artful evasion of the subject in dis-

*Mat. 26: 23, Mark 14: 20, John 13: 26, in Greek. (*a*) Ch. 1, § 1-8. †Mark 1: 9, 1 Cor. 1: 14, Acts 8: 38.

cussion. But an inference is a conclusion fairly drawn from what is admitted to be true or has been before proved. That which is a proper inference, must be found in, and be a component part of, what is admitted or proved to be true; or it must be manifestly and inseparably connected with it. If this is not the case, the conclusion drawn, is not, properly speaking, an inference. It is only conjecture or assertion. In consequence of man's imperfect judgment; inferences may appear fair to one person, and dark, if not fanciful to another. In religious matters therefore but little reliance can be placed upon inferences or upon the inferential evidence resulting from them, where there is no positive scripture testimony on the subject. This remark has the more force, as every religious doctrine or duty which God requires men to believe or practice, is expressed in some portion of his word in plain, positive language. Every doctrine or practice therefore which claims to be religious, and which has no positive scriptural evidence to support its claims, ought to be rejected as being destitute of Divine authority by which it can be sustained.

2. *From the use of the word "into," it cannot be inferred that persons were immersed for baptism.* One essential part of immersion is to go or be put entirely under water (*a*). This is not the only meaning of the word "into." Indeed this is not even one of its significations. It does not denote *under* or *entirely under*. When "Abram went down into Egypt," he did not go under the ground; when Christ went up into a "mountain," he did not go down under it; when the two Marys entered "into" our Saviour's "sepulchre," they did not go under it; when the mariners with whom Paul was sailing to Rome, were in distress, "they were minded" to "trust" the ship "into," not under a "certain creek."* These and similar passages in the word of God, show most conclusively, that the word into does not mean under. When it is said of Philip and the Eunuch; "they both went down into the water;" the language does not convey the idea that they went under the water; or performed one essential part of immersion. If it had been said that both Philip and the Eunuch went down under the water; then each of them would have performed one act which is

(*a*) B. i. P. vii. Ch. 1, § 4, par. 4. *Gen. 12: 10, Mat. 5: 1, Mark 16: 5, Acts 27: 39.

essential to immersion. But to go "down into the water" is not to go under it; because *into* never means under. To go down into the garden, or into the meadow, or into the cellar; is not to go under the garden, or under the meadow, or under the cellar. To go into, then, is not to go under; and to go down into the water is not therefore to go under it in any proper sense of the words used. Nor did going "into the water" baptize the Eunuch. But after they had both gone down "into the water," then Philip baptized him. The language used plainly teaches this fact. It is this; "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him."* If it were asked; what did Philip do to the Eunuch after they had both gone "down into the water?" the answer would be; "he baptized him." The act of going into the water, was not therefore going under it, was not immersion in any of its essential parts, was not baptism; for the ordinance of baptism was administered after they were both in or at the water. To say therefore that the Eunuch was immersed because he went down into the water, is to affirm what the language does not teach either wholly or in part. Here then we have no inferential evidence in favor of immersion. In this passage there is no position mentioned or admitted, or proved, from which to infer that the Eunuch was immersed. The declaration that he was baptized by immersion is a mere assertion unsustained by Divine authority or by even a tolerable inference. It is mere unsupported fancy.

3. *From the use of the words "out of," immersion for baptism cannot be inferred.* Because it is said that "Moses—brought" the children of Israel "up out of the land of Egypt;" no one would therefore infer that they had been under that land. The proper inference would be that they had been in that country. To infer that the lightning which "cometh out of," had been under "the east," would be mere trifling. But a fair inference would be that before it came "*out of*," it had been in, not under, "the east."† For Christ to depart "out of this world,"‡ was not to depart from under the ground. When it is stated, that "Jesus went up—out of the water," and also that Philip and the Eunuch came "up out of the water;"§ it might be inferred, not that

*Acts 8: 38. †Ex. 32: 1, Deut. 5: 6, Mat. 24: 27. ‡John 13: 1. §Mat. 3: 16, Acts 8: 39.

any one or more of them had been under the water; but that each of them had been *in* or *into* the water, perhaps one, perhaps six inches deep. To suppose that coming out of the water is coming from under it,—or shows that he who came out of it, had been under it, or was immersed, is as inconsistent as to say ; that, because Israel came out of Egypt, therefore they had been immersed in, or had been under, the ground. It would be strictly absurd. Besides, as *in* or *into* never signifies under ; so the expression "out of," never signifies from under. Out of the meadow does not signify from under the meadow ; nor out of the garden, from under the garden ; nor out of the cellar, from under the cellar ; nor out of the barn or house or bed, from under the barn or house or bed. As therefore the expression "out of," never denotes from under ; so when Christ or the Eunuch is said to come "out of" the water, it is impossible from this language to infer with the least show of propriety, that either of them had been under the water or immersed. To affirm therefore, that Christ and the Eunuch were immersed, because they came "out of the water," is to speak not only without positive instruction from the word of God ; but it is giving to the expressions a meaning which does not belong to them. Such an assertion is therefore nothing like a fair inference drawn from what God's word teaches. Such trifling with Divine revelation as is exhibited by those who use the words "out of," as if they denoted from under, deserves the severest rebuke.

4. *The doctrine of immersion cannot be inferred from the use of the Greek word* (εις) *translated "into."* This Greek word is found more than six hundred times in the Greek Testament. It is used in a great variety of senses. Twelve of these are here mentioned. It denotes *on*, *to*, *in*, *unto*, *into*, (not under,) *at*, *against*, *before*, *upon*, *for*, *towards*, *among*.* But it does not signify under, nor is it so rendered in the New Testament. From the use of this word by the Holy Spirit, it cannot be ascertained that either Philip or the Eunuch wet so much as the soles of their feet, when "he baptized him." All we can cetainly know from its use is, that the Eunuch was not immersed ; for the word (εις) for

*See Luke 15: 22, and 24: 5, John 7: 5, and 13: 1, Mat. 3: 11, and 28: 11, Acts 8: 40, and 9: 1, and 22: 30, Rom. 13: 6, Mat. 26: 28, 1 Pet. 3: 21, and 4: 8, in Greek and English.

into, does not denote under. If the Spirit of God chooses to use a word which denotes *to*, *at*, *towards*, and the like; no person can, without presumption, say positively, that it means *in or into* in a particular connection, unless the sense of the passage requires it to have that particular signification. As the sense of the passage which speaks of the baptism of the Eunuch, will not be injured by translating the word (εις) for "into," by *to* or *towards;* either of these may, in that very connection, be its signification. From this word therefore, it cannot be fairly inferred that either Philip or the Eunuch touched the water with their feet when Philip administered the ordinance of baptism to him; and much less that either of them was entirely under its surface. Besides, this Greek word (εις) does not denote under or below the surface, and to go or be put under water is indispensable in immersion. Since therefore, when it is said; they "went down" (εις) "into the water," the sense would not be injured, if the word (εις) was rendered *to* or *towards*, instead of into; and since this Greek word does not denote under or below the surface; no fair inference can be drawn from it to sustain immersion. Indeed, that the Eunuch was not immersed is certain, because the language used by inspiration does not signify immersion.

5. *From the use of the Greek word* (εκ) *translated "out of," immersion cannot be inferred.* This word is used by the Holy Spirit, when it is said; "Philip and the Eunuch came "up out of the water,"* and in more than three hundred other places in the Greek Testament. It literally denotes *from.* It is so translated in nearly two hundred passages in the New Testament. It marks the point from which a movement is made. This appears from the expression; "there came other boats" (εκ) "from Tiberias."† These boats must have commenced their movement from some part of the water near which the town of Tiberias was situated. They could not have sailed on the dry land upon which the buildings were erected. It is evident therefore that these boats did not come out of, but "from Tiberias;" and that the word (εκ) translated *from*, expresses the point from which their movement commenced. When therefore Philip and the Eunuch came up (εκ) from the water, we cannot infer

*Acts 8: 39 in Greek. †John 6: 23.

from the use of this word, that either of them so much as wet the soles of their feet in the water; and much less, that either of them was immersed. The only proper inference that can be drawn from the use of the Greek word (εκ) used in this connection by the Holy Spirit, is that they had been at or near the water mentioned. Besides, the original word (εκ) translated "out of," does not denote *from under*. It is not used in this sense in any portion of the word of God. No person can therefore, with the least plausibility, infer from the use of the original word (εκ) translated "out of," (not from under,) that either Philip or the Eunuch was immersed. The same words are used of both; "*they* both came" (εκ) "up out of the water." *They* both went down into the water. This language is used of Philip as really as it is of the Eunuch. What it proves of the one, it must therefore prove of the other. It however does not prove, nor intimate, nor suppose that either Philip or the Eunuch was immersed.

6. *From the use of the Greek word* (εν) *rendered "with," immersion cannot be inferred.* In the Greek Testament this word (εν) is used about three hundred times. It is translated into English by the word "*at*," more than one hundred times; and by the word "*with*," in more than one hundred and fifty passages; and by other words in other places. But it *does not signify*, and *is not translated*, *under*, in the whole New Testament (*a*). This word therefore cannot be forced into the service of immersion by any fair construction; nor can it be made the ground from which immersion can be inferred. As the word (εν) does not denote under or below the surface; when it is said, "John baptized" (εν) "in" (not under) "Enon,"—(εν) "in Jordan," (not under it,)—(εν) "with water;"* it cannot be inferred from this language, that he baptized under the waters of Jordan or under those at Enon; because the word (εν) in Greek never denotes *under;* nor is this the signification of either *in* or *with*, in English. But from the language used, it may be fairly concluded, that John baptized at or near Enon or the Jordan, "with water" taken from that fountain or river;

(*a*) This word (εν) is Greek. So are εις, εκ and απο. They are not therefore found in the original of the Old Testament, which is Hebrew. *Mat. 3: 6. 11, John 3: 23 in Greek and English.

because the Spirit of God uses a word (εν) in these passages of scripture, which almost universally signifies *at* or *with*, though it is not used to express *under*. And it should always be borne in mind that in receiving immersion the person not only goes *near* or *to* or *in* or *into*, but he must necessarily go or be put *under*, the water in order to be immersed. From the use of this word (εν), it cannot therefore be inferred with any degree of propriety, that John, when he baptized, wet the soles of his own feet; or that the foot of any one whom he baptized came in contact with water. No one can therefore, from the use of this word (εν), even conjecture that John immersed or put entirely under water, all whom he baptized.

Even when this Greek word (εν) is translated *in*, it frequently denotes *at* or *near by*. This is manifest from the following language; "In" (εν) "the place where" Jesus "was crucified, there was a garden."* Certainly, this garden was *at* or *near*, not *under*, the place where our Saviour was crucified.

7. *Immersion cannot be inferred from the use of the Greek word* (απο) *translated "out of."* It is used in the Greek Testament more than three hundred times. It literally signifies *from*, and is so translated in the New Testament more than two hundred and fifty times. It not only may, but often must, be so translated; as in the question which John proposed to some of the Jews; "Who hath warned you to flee" (απο) "from," (not out of,) "the wrath to come."† Besides, this word (απο) never signifies *from under*, any more than do the English words "out of" (*a*). The expression, "Jesus—went up—out of the water"‡ might, without injuring the sense or deviating from the original, be rendered; Jesus went up *from* the water. As therefore the original word (απο) here rendered "out of," never signifies *from under;* it cannot, when used of our Saviour, intimate that he had been under the water or immersed. If a person comes "out of" the water, it may be fairly inferred that he had been in it; but to infer that because he came "out of," that therefore he had been *under*, the water, would be absurd (*a*). But how much more absurd would it be, to

*John 19: 41 in Greek and English. †Mat. 3: 7. 16 in Greek and English. *(a)* § 3. ‡Mat. 3: 16.

infer that because Jesus Christ came (απο) *from*, that therefore he had been *under* the surface of the water. From the use of this original word, all that can be fairly inferred is, that our Saviour had been *at* or *near*, and then came (απο) *from* the water; and by no means that he had been *under* the water or below its surface.

8. *Immersion cannot be inferred from the use of the word baptize.* This is the word, the meaning of which is sought. To say that the word baptize denotes immerse, because some men assert that it does, is not fair inferential evidence. To infer immersion from the use of this or any other word; it is necessary to find it so situated in some one passage at least of the word of God, that no other signification can fairly be given to it without destroying, or at least injuring, the sense. The word baptize is not so situated in any passage of scripture. In every place where it is found in God's word; it may have a signification different from immerse. In the baptism of Christ, or of the Eunuch, or of Paul, or of any other person or persons mentioned in the word of God,* (*a*) not a single expression is used which necessarily includes or teaches immersion. That the word baptize denotes immerse cannot therefore be inferred from the connection in which it is found in any passage of scripture; because the connection in no passage necessarily requires this to be its signification. Since therefore, God in his word, does not say that baptize signifies immerse; since he does not use the word in any connection which requires it to have this meaning; since he does not, in *one* passage of scripture, call that baptism, which in *another*, he calls immersion; we have no scriptural evidence that immersion is the only, the principal or any meaning of the word baptize (*b*). As that cannot be fairly inferred *from* a word, which is not proved to be *in* it; so no one can, consistently with reason, infer that the word baptize denotes immerse; because this is not necessarily one of its scriptural significations; nor is this proved, from the word of God, to be one of its meanings. From the use of the word baptize, therefore, no proper inference can be drawn in favor of immersion being even *a mode*, and much less *the only mode* of baptism.

*See Mat. 3: 13–16, Mark 1: 8–10, Luke 3: 21, Acts 8: 36–39, and 9: 18, and 22: 16. (*a*) § 2–7. (*b*) Ch. 1, § 1–8.

9. *That immersion is baptism cannot be inferred from the fact that the word baptize is transferred into the English Bible.* In every passage except four,* where *baptize* is used in the Greek Testament, it is transferred into English by merely omitting the prefixes and giving the words an English termination. This one fact proves conclusively that the translators of the Holy scriptures into the English language, were wise and faithful men. There is no other single word in the English language, which can express all that baptize frequently signifies. When water is, by a New Testament minister, applied to a person "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" he is said to be baptized. This one word often expresses all that is denoted by this whole sentence. But all this cannot be expressed by any other single word in the English language. A log or an animal may be immersed or put entirely under water; but neither can be baptized. A person who is not a minister of the gospel, may immerse himself or another; but a minister only can baptize (*a*). Indeed there is no one word which is originally a part of the Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, Ethiopic, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish or English language, which will convey to the mind, the exact meaning of the Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize. Perhaps no other word in any language, would be a complete substitute for the word baptize. This being the fact, wisdom to discover this point, and faithfulness in presenting the original idea in proper words, will lead those who translate the New Testament from the Greek into other languages, to transfer the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize into their translations. Nor would this transfer of the word baptize imply that it denoted immerse; nor could any person on that account infer that immersion was one of its significations. To alter the word baptize, therefore, in order to sustain a favorite notion, is not a mark of that "wisdom" which "is from above."† But to do so shows a bigoted attachment to preconceived opinions, and a reckless disregard of Divine truth. The christian loves his religious principles and practices, because God in his word teaches them. But he does

*See Mark 7: 4, Luke 11: 38, and Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. *(a)* B. i. P. iv. Ch. 1, § 5, B. i. P. vi. Ch. 2, § 1–3. †James 3: 17.

not adopt the scriptures of truth; because, and so far as, they sustain his peculiar opinions (*a*).

(a) It is no new thing for a class of persons to alter the Bible. Often when men discover an irreconcilable difference between their own beloved and perhaps long-cherished opinions, and the word of God; many of them will alter or so modify the Bible as to make it conform to their notions. They would much rather take this step than adopt the word of God as their only rule in all religious duties. These alterations they always call improvements. Several societies of people have adopted this course. (1.) The Romanists added the Apocrypha and their own traditions to the Bible. They also substituted the Vulgate, a very inaccurate Latin translation, as their standard, instead of the original Hebrew and Greek. (2.) The Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Arminians found a new translation necessary to sustain their system. Accordingly they made a translation of the New Testament to suit their notions. These did not alter the Old Testament; as they do not even profess to have much regard for the instruction contained in that. (3.) The Unitarians who generally reject the inspiration of the Old Testament have made what they call a translation of the New. In this they omit many verses and some portions of chapters, besides altering many others. They desired and made for themselves, a Unitarian New Testament. (4.) The Shakers altered the Bible in such a way as to make it suit themselves. (5.) The New Jerusalemites or Swedenborgians remodeled the scriptures so as to make them, if possible, consistent with their fancies. (6.) The Campbellites made a brief paraphrase on the New Testament. This they represented as a new translation. (7.) The Baptists discovered that the Bible must be altered or no believer in its explicit language, could adopt the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism; because it made no such declaration, Accordingly they must alter the Bible under the name of a new translation. In this the word immerse which is inelegant Latin a little modified, is frequently, though not always, substituted for baptize which is a modified Greek word. Thus they transferred a Latin word into their version of the Bible, while they were saying all manner of evil against others for transferring a Greek word. With them it was *right* to transfer an inelegant word, native to Pagan and adopted by Papal Rome; but *wrong* to transfer an elegant Greek word taught us by "the Holy Ghost." (1 Cor. 2: 13.) In altering the Bible to make it suit their own system and in substituting the word immerse for baptize; they have publicly acknowledged that the unadulterated word of God, does not sustain their notions; and that the word baptize does not always denote immerse as they have so often and so positively declared. If it did always signify immerse; there would be no necessity for making the change in any case; and if immerse was in any one instance, substituted for baptize, the substitution must be made in all cases; for if it always means immerse, it ought always to be so rendered, and not in some passages be translated by another word as it often is in the Baptist bible. But if they did not really believe that immerse was the only meaning of baptize, they ought not to have made the assertion so repeatedly; and if immerse is its only meaning, then why not always so render the word?

The second edition of the Baptist Bible was published in Philadelphia in the year 1842, by J. B. Lippincott. Its editor, A. C. Kendrick, intimates in his preface to the New Testament, that all the principal Pedo-Baptist commentators sustain his views in relation to the word baptize. But so far are all these commentators from maintaining that immersion is the *only mode* of baptism, (and this is his view on the subject,) that not one of them adopts that opinion. It is true that several of them admit that immersion is *one mode* of baptism; but not one of them says or even intimates that it is the *only mode*. To make such a statement then concerning those commentators, is a crime which deserves a harsher name than can be given to it here. A system that can suffer its leading advocates thus deliberately to pervert the truth and vilify the righteous dead, will need more than one alteration in the Bible before it can pass current with men of truth and veracity. But with all the changes they have made in the word of God to make an immersion Bible to suit their system; the most they have accomplished is to make immersion appear to be *one* mode of baptism. They will have to alter it again to make it say that immersion and that only is baptism. Without this, their exclusive system cannot stand the test. Now their immersion Bible affirms that immersion is a mode of baptism, not that it is the only mode. Their Bible yet avoids the point in dispute between immersers and others. This point is, not whether immersion is or is not a mode of baptism; but whether it is or is not the *only mode*. Their Bible evades this point. To prove that immersion is baptism would by no means prove it to be the only

10. *Learning cannot find in the word of God, any inferential evidence in favor of immersion.* Learning cannot find that which does not exist. And, as there is no inferential evidence in the holy scriptures to sustain the claims of immersion; so learning cannot find any such evidence in God's word. Learning does not create evidence of any kind on any subject. It only discovers and presents evidence clearly to the mind. Ignorance leaves evidence undiscovered or unperceived, and substitutes assertion for argument. And when learning throws so much light on a subject that even ignorance cannot but perceive in some degree the force of truth; then it begins to revile learning, as if its great and principal business was to deceive those who were able to perceive the force and application of the evidence which it presents in favor of truth. Thus the votaries of ignorance are led on by its despotic influence in the paths of self-deception, till they stumble on the dark mountains of vanity, and are "destroyed for lack of knowledge."* These, at the same time, are, by this their tyrannic master, induced to believe that ignorance is almost immaculate purity, and learning only varnished vileness. When a subject is made so plain by learning that even the ignorant cannot avoid perceiving the convincing power of evidence, they then immediately fancy that learning can prove wrong to be right and right, wrong. In this way ignorance keeps its slaves bound in its chains, and will continue to do so, unless they allow themselves to believe that learning which makes difficult subjects plain, is at least as likely to be honest as ignorance which darkens "counsel by words without knowledge."† Indeed, a wiser "than Solomon" teaches us, that men love "darkness rather than light, because their deeds" are "evil." Upon ignorance therefore which loves "darkness rather than light,"‡ must the charge of dishonesty rest. That which brings matters to the light cannot be chargeable with keeping them in the dark. If a charge of dishonesty

*Hos. 4: 6. †Job 38: 2. ‡Mat. 12: 42, John 3: 19.

mode of baptism. To make out their position, that immersion and that only is baptism; they must alter their Bible at least once more. (8.) To the Bible, the Mormons have added their Book of Mormon and other fancies. They are also making or have made a new translation of the New Testament, to make it correspond as much as may be, with their system of irreligion. It is therefore nothing remarkable to find men more willing to force the Bible into a conformity with their own notions than to lay aside these for Divine truth.

is to be made, it must therefore be made against ignorance, not against learning. Besides, ignorance costs nothing. No labor, no time, no means are required to make a person ignorant. But not a little of all these is required to make a person learned. Now since ignorance can deceive as well as learning, if not better, (because it may be sincere in its deceptions,) who would labor long and hard for the sake of deceiving others when by remaining in a state of ignorance, he could, without labor, accomplish his object better? There is little danger of real learning deceiving any person in relation to baptism or any other subject; while sophistry, self-sufficiency, bigotry and ignorance are to be dreaded by all who would not be their dupes. There is no danger of true learning ever presenting any inferential evidence in favor of immersion, as if that were thus taught in the word of God; for this plain reason, that true learning, when it is brought to bear on that subject, will soon perceive that, in the Scriptures, there is no such evidence in favor of immersion.

CHAPTER IV.

NO ALLUSION TO IMMERSION IN THE WORD OF GOD.

1. *An allusion cannot, properly speaking, be made to that which does not exist.* To allude or make an allusion, is to refer to something. In making an allusion, the thing alluded to is not generally at the time, mentioned in plain words. But the fact that an allusion is made to any thing, proves that what is alluded to, does exist. If therefore a thing does not exist, it cannot be alluded to. But as immersion is not so much as once mentioned in the whole word of God, no person ought to expect to find therein an allusion made to it; for it must be but a fanciful conjecture to suppose that Omniscience would allude in the Divine word, to what he, in it, does not even once name. Nor would it be less fanciful to imagine that God would very often mention baptism in his word by its own proper designation, and not once call it immersion, or in any way describe it by language which denotes immerse, if he intended to teach mankind that this was baptism or the only mode of baptism. To find an allusion

made in the word of God to immersion, is not therefore to be expected; because the thing itself is not therein named.

2. *The word bury does not allude to immersion.* This word in English does not either literally or figuratively refer to immersion. To say that a person is buried, might allude to the decay of his body, or to its resurrection, or possibly to the immortality of the soul of him whose body was buried; but to say that bury literally alludes to immersion, is mere unbridled conjecture. Every one knows that to bury the dead is not the same thing as to put the living entirely under water. To bury does not mean to immerse. To say that a person is buried then cannot literally teach or allude to immersion. Figurately, the word bury denotes to hide or conceal, not to immerse. The person who is immersed is not even concealed the moment he is under the water. Nor is there any attempt made in immersion to conceal or hide the person immersed. Nothing of this kind was attempted, when individuals, both male and female were immersed in a state of perfect nudity. So far then is the word *bury*, in its figurative signification, from alluding to or teaching immersion, that immersers themselves do not even attempt to conceal or hide the immersed. This act therefore does not, cannot bear any resemblance to the figurative meaning of the word *bury*.

The Greek word (θαπτω) used for *bury*,* expresses all the parts of an ancient funeral. These were various. (1.) The dead body was washed, not by immersing it entirely under, but by applying water to it; (2.) It was wrapped in a clean cloth; (3.) It was laid out; (4.) It was laid in a suitable place, usually for one or more days; (5.) It was anointed; (6.) It was embalmed; (7.) It was carried out to the narrow "house appointed for all the living;" (8.) It was deposited in the grave.† This original word (θαπτω) which in its various modifications, expresses much more than the English word *funeral*, has this eight-fold signification(*a*). For a person therefore to say that, when this word is used, an allusion is made to immersion, or that immersion is taught by it, is to proclaim himself a mere tyro in Greek literature.

*See Rom. 6: 4, Col. 2: 12, Mark. 14: 8, John 12: 7, in Greek and English. †See Acts 9: 37, Mat. 27: 59. 60, Mark 15: 46, and 16: 1, Luke 7: 12, and 23: 53. 56, and 24: 1, Job 30: 23, John 11: 38. 44. (*a*)See Greek Lexicons.

Indeed, the most superficial observer cannot but perceive that a word of such a signification, can have no allusion to immersion. If a person should affirm that the word *funeral* referred to immersion, or that going to a funeral indicated that immersion was baptism; the assertion would be sufficiently absurd. But to say that a word (θαπτω) which denotes to wrap in a cloth, to anoint, to lay out and to embalm, besides expressing all that is included in the term *funeral*, alludes to immersion; is crowding too hard on the common sense of mankind.

3. *The word bury or buried does not in any passage of scripture, allude to immerse.* Men have quoted three passages of the word of God, to prove such an allusion. In two of these, the word buried is used; in one it is not, though the death of Christ is mentioned in this last. These are (1.) "We are buried with him by baptism into death;" (2.) Ye are "buried with him in baptism;" (3.) "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death."* These expressions of scripture are sometimes supposed to allude to immersion. Men often assert that they teach this to be a mode, if not the only mode of baptism. As the word bury or buried does not, either in its literal or figurative sense, denote immerse(*a*); so in the use of that word, no such allusion can be found. If these portions of God's word are carefully examined, no allusion to immersion can be found in them. This appears (1.) From the fact that the word *bury*(*a*) or "*buried*" does not signify any thing that resembles what is done to a person who is immersed(*b*). The word bury or buried does not in itself, allude to immerse. (2.) Moreover, in the burying mentioned in these passages, persons are said to be "buried with" Christ "by baptism into death," not into the grave. The death of Christ took place on the cross. We "are buried with him by baptism into death." But death by crucifixion has no resemblance to immersion; therefore baptism into Christ's death on the cross, does not, *cannot*, teach, or even allude to immersion. There is not the least resemblance between the Saviour's death on the cross several feet above the ground, and the putting of a person entirely under water. That any person should ever imagine that being buried with

*Rom. 6: 3. 4, Col. 2: 12. (*a*) § 2. (*b*) B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4.

him by baptism into death on the cross, had any reference to immersion, is truly surprising. (3.) Besides, if this burying, instead of being into death on the cross, as it is, had been, buried with him into his grave; still there could be, even then, no allusion to immersion. Our Saviour when buried was laid in a "new tomb—hewn out of a rock." A "great stone" was "placed at the door of" this his "sepulchre." The place in which he was laid was so large that the two Marys "entering into the sepulchre—saw a young man sitting at the right side" of it; and that Peter and the beloved "disciple"* entered it at the same time. Our Lord's sepulchre was therefore a small room hewn out of a rock, sufficiently large for a number of persons to enter and remain in it together. There is then no more resemblance between the act of laying the dead body of Christ in the tomb and that of a living person going entirely under water, than there would be between immersion and laying a dead body in a small bed-room. Between the two acts, there is not the least resemblance; nor is there the most distant allusion in one of them, made to the other. (4.) Between the mode of disposing of the dead in any country by any people and immersion, there is not the least resemblance; and consequently in the one there can be no allusion made to the other. Some portions of the human race consume their dead on funeral piles; some deposit a part of them at least on trees; some place the body in a sitting posture; some place the dead in a kind of artificial caves called vaults; and some remove the earth and lay the body in the place from which the material was removed and then sprinkle or shovel the earth in upon the corpse. The last two modes are adopted by christian and civilized nations. The others are practiced by the savage and semi-barbarous. It is manifest that to consume a body by fire or place it on a tree, or in a sitting posture, cannot resemble immersion. To lay a corpse in a vault is like placing it in a cellar, not like putting a living man under water. Nor does that mode of interment resemble immersion, in which the earth is removed from its original position, the body laid in the place from which the earth was taken, and then the dead covered by putting upon it a small quantity of earth at

*Mat. 27: 60, Mark 15: 46, and 16: 5, Luke 23: 53, and 24: 3, John 19: 41. 42, and 20: 6. 8.

a time. This mode of burying might resemble sprinkling or pouring, but could not resemble immersion; because in this, there is no one act that looks in the least like putting a living person under water. But if any people should, in disposing of their dead, take the body and turn it over backwards and thrust it into the ground; then that kind of burying would resemble immersion as practiced by some; and if any turned the body forward or made it kneel down, and then thrust it into the earth; in this case, immersion as practiced by others would be represented. But as no nation or people, savage or civilized, adopt either of these modes of burying their dead; so immersion as practiced by any class of immersers, does not and cannot resemble the mode in which any people bury their dead. It is manifest therefore that no nation or tribe of men so dispose of their dead, as to make in their interment, an allusion to immersion. (5.) To be buried with Christ "by baptism into death," does not teach or allude to any mode of baptism with water. It is expressly stated that those who are buried with him by baptism into death, are "baptized into Jesus Christ;" "walk in newness of life;" have their "old man—crucified;" do "not serve sin;" are dead "unto sin;" are "alive unto God;" are "alive from the dead;" have "obeyed from the heart;" are "made free from sin;" are "the servants of righteousness;" are "become the servants of God;" are "risen with him through the faith of the operation of God;" are "quickened together with him;" and "have their trespasses" forgiven.* The persons here described must have been true christians. No external application of water in any mode or by any person, could possibly remove from the sinner, his "carnal mind which is enmity against God,"† and produce in him that spiritual mind which is here described. To do this is the work of the Holy Spirit(*a*); not of baptism with water. It is manifest from facts that baptism with water, whatever may be the mode or whoever the administrator, is not always preceded, accompanied or followed by the regenerating and converting grace of God's spirit. Too many after they are baptized, no matter how or by whom the ordinance may have been administered, prove by their actions that they are yet

*Rom. 6: 3. 4. 6. 11. 13. 17. 18. 22, Col. 2: 12. 13. †Rom. 8: 7. (*a*) B. i, P. v, Ch. 1, § 2.

"enemies" of God "by wicked works."* Simon the Samaritan sorcerer, after "he was baptized" with water, was still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity."† His could not therefore have been that baptism which leads those who receive it to "walk in newness of life." As no baptism but that of the Holy Ghost can produce this new and spiritual "walk;" so whenever this "newness of life" is produced, baptism with the Holy Ghost or regeneration has taken place. But this holy walk results from being "baptized into" Christ's "death;" therefore this baptism must be "with the Holy Ghost,"‡ and not with water; because this does and baptism with water does not, invariably produce "newness of life." The baptism therefore mentioned in these passages, being baptism with the Holy Ghost does not teach or allude to immersion or any mode of water baptism. (6.) Christians, it is said, "are risen with" Christ, "through the faith of the operation of God."§ This rising is not the act of coming out of the grave. Christians, as well as others, will start from the sleep of ages, when the sound of the Archangel's trumpet shall re-echo along the cold damp vaults of death, on the morning of the general judgment day. But the rising here mentioned is that which has already taken place in every true believer. "Ye *are risen*," not ye *shall rise*, is the language of God's word to his people. This rising then which is by faith, and which has already occurred in the case of every true christian, must be a rising from that state in which he was dead in sin. But rising from a state of death in sin, is simply being delivered from its power by the regenerating grace of God's Spirit. And to deliver the soul from the power of sin, and remove its guilt by the blood of Christ, cannot be represented or alluded to by taking the body up from under the water. (7.) If a person is put entirely under water, he may be raised up out of it again; but this act of raising the body up out of the water, can have no necessary connection with that rising from a state of spiritual death, which is "by the faith of the operation of God." To be raised from spiritual death is one thing; and to be raised up from under water, is another. To give natural life to a dead body, or to give spiritual life

*Col. 1: 21. †Acts 8: 13. 23. ‡Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16. §Col. 2: 12.

to a dead soul, and thus to bring the one to natural and the other to spiritual life, can have, in the act, no resemblance or allusion to the raising up of a person from under the water. (8.) That any person in his senses should ever seriously suppose that, to lay a person down on his face or on his back in water in such a way as to cover him entirely with the element, resembles or alludes to the death of Christ, which was caused by elevating him perpendicularly upon a cross some distance above the earth, is, to a reflecting mind, truly surprising. No two things can resemble each other less or be less likely to allude the one to the other, than immersion and crucifixion. Had our Saviour been drowned or buried alive, then his death might have been partially symbolized by immersion. But to imagine that immersion represents or alludes to crucifixion, is a flight of fancy worthy of the German Anabaptists. For sensible men to say, that to be "buried with" Christ "by baptism into death" on the cross, is to be put entirely under water, is a complete solecism. What can be more absurd, than to say that to be put entirely under water, means to be suspended upon the cross!! or to say that immersion resembles crucifixion!! The advocates of such a wild fancy, must, to men of sense, appear truly ridiculous.

4. *Noah and his family were preserved in the ark; but this fact does not teach or allude to immersion.* The language in which some persons fancy that immersion is taught or alluded to, is this; "God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was—preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; the like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us."* In the ark, Noah and his family were saved from the all-devouring flood. They "only remained alive" of the whole human race who then lived on earth. The ark, the vessel in which they were saved from this overwhelming calamity, was borne up by, and "went upon, the face" or surface "of the waters."† Noah and his family were saved in the ark. This vessel was borne up, "upon the face of the waters." This deliverance from a tremendous temporal judgment, of all who were actually in the ark, represents the deliverance, from eternal misery, of all true believers. This spiritual salva-

*1 Pet. 3: 20. 21. †Gen. 7: 17. 18. 23.

tion is enjoyed by those, and by those only, who have by faith entered the spiritual ark, the Lord Jesus Christ. By faith sinners are brought into this ark; for by faith, and by faith only, are they united to Christ. God the Spirit, in regeneration, or when they are baptized with the Holy Ghost, produces this "faith" in their souls.* The baptism here mentioned saves us. As no baptism is essential to salvation, except that of the Spirit; so this baptism which saves us, or is essential to salvation, must therefore be baptism with the Holy Ghost, and not with water. It is this spiritual baptism therefore, of which Noah's preservation in the ark was a figure. But his preservation in the ark could not be a figure of immersion; because there is no resemblance between the one and the other. That there is no allusion to immersion in the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark, appears; (1.) From the fact that they were saved by being *in the ark*, above the water, not by being put under that fluid, as is the case with all who are immersed; (2.) From the fact that the ark "went on the face of the waters," or floated on their surface, so that even the vessel in which they were saved, was not immersed or put entirely under water. (3.) To be carried in the ark above water, could not possibly allude to, or represent immersion, or the putting of persons all over under its surface. (4.) They were under the roof of the ark; and persons are usually immersed in the open air. (5.) They were entirely hid from those who were on the outside of the ark; but when persons are in the act of receiving immersion, they are visible to those who are near them; because water is transparent, but the covering of the ark was not. (6.) The covering of the ark did not come in contact with Noah and his family, or with their dress; but those who are covered with water in immersion, have the covering element, water, in contact at least with their dress. It is manifest therefore that the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark, did not, in any sense of the word, allude to immersion. In those who perished in the flood, an allusion to immersion might easily be discovered; for these were entirely covered with water, and so are the immersed. Here then is a very manifest resemblance

*Gal. 5: 22, Eph. 2: 8, Phil. 1: 29, Heb. 12: 2.

between those who were wholly covered with the waters of the deluge, and those who are wholly covered with water in immersion. But Noah and his family were not immersed or put entirely under water. Even the very ark in which they were preserved, was not immersed; for it moved on the surface of, instead of sinking entirely under, the water. A person in the ark was as safe from being immersed, as he would be in a house or church, in which no cistern could be found. In the preservation of Noah and his household in the ark, there was not a single point which resembles immersion in the least. Noah and his family were *saved from* being immersed in water. Those who enjoy that baptism of which their preservation in the ark was a type, are now *saved from* being immersed in sin, from remaining under "the wrath of God" and from legal condemnation. They will also, in the world to come, be *saved from* being immersed "in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."* In the preservation, therefore, of Noah and his household in the ark, there can be no allusion to, or evidence in favor of, immersion.

5. *The expression "washing" or "washed with water," does not allude to immersion.* The language used by inspiration, and which includes the words "washing" and "washed," is this; "Ye are washed;"—"Christ—loved the church—that he might—cleanse it with the washing of water by the word;"—"He saved us by the washing of regeneration;"—"Let us draw near" to God, "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water;"—and "wash away thy sins."† In relation to these passages, it may be remarked, (1.) That the word immerse is not used in any of them. Nor does the Greek word (λουω) or (λουτρον) used in them for wash necessarily denote immerse.‡ (2.) If the washing mentioned in them, is literal; then to perform such a washing, more is necessary than to dip that to be washed into water, so that it may be entirely covered and then immediately take it out again. No literal pollution could be removed in this way. To wash away literal defilement supposes more than this. Indeed, in washing literally, a part of the thing washed, if

*Rev. 21: 8. †1 Cor. 6: 11, Eph. 5: 25. 26, Tit. 3: 5, Heb. 10: 22, Acts. 22, 16. ‡See Eph. 5: 26, Heb. 10: 23 in Greek, and Greek Lexicons on the words.

not the whole of it, is frequently out of the water during the operation. Moreover, in washing a person, or almost any vessel, the water is applied to what is washed, instead of even dipping what is washed into the water. If the article washed is not so much as dipped into the water, certainly it could not be immersed or put entirely under water in the act of being washed. When persons wash themselves, or are washed by others, or when tables, churns, tubs, pails, or the like, are washed; they are not usually, if at all, immersed in water. A literal washing therefore requires more than immersion; and it is not usually performed by immersing the articles washed. (3.) In ceremonial washings water is applied to a part only of the person washed, to make him ceremonially "clean every whit."* (4.) The word *wash* is used to express the falling of tears on the part washed. Our Saviour's feet were "washed" with "tears."† Every one knows that tears always fall in drops. That which is washed "with tears," is therefore washed with drops falling upon it; or in other words, it is washed by sprinkling. This washing then could not possibly teach immersion; for no one can, for a moment, suppose that our Lord's feet were put entirely under water in the tears with which they were washed. (5.) If the washing mentioned in these passages, is spiritual; then the body is not represented as being washed either wholly or in part; because, spiritual washing is that of the soul,—not the washing of the body in any of its parts, or for any purpose. (6.) The first of these passages may denote that christians "are washed" in the blood of Christ; in the second and fourth, the persons washed had water applied to them in some mode to symbolize the washing away of sin. The third, as it is expressly called "the washing of regeneration," not the washing "of water," or of baptism, must denote the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit in his regenerating power upon the soul. In the fifth, the washing "away of sins," is mentioned. No truly converted person can be made to believe that this work is effected by the application of water to the body. Only two of these passages therefore can possibly speak of baptism. And in neither of these is any word used, that denotes immersion; nor is any such word found in the con-

*John 13: 10. †Luke 7: 38. 44.

text. Not the least intimation then is given us in any one of these passages that immersion is baptism. But as nothing is said in them, either directly or indirectly, in favor of immersion for baptism or for any other purpose; they can therefore contain no real allusion to that substitute for a Divine ordinance. (7.) As sprinkling is mentioned in one of these passages, that mode may be taught or alluded to when the application of water is mentioned. (8.) But it is clear that immersion is not taught or alluded to, in any of these passages, whether a literal, ceremonial or spiritual washing is taught in one or more of them. (9.) The word *wash* does not signify immerse. This is not one of its meanings in the English language. (10.) If it, at any time, signifies baptize, this is a figurative sense of the term; as *baptize* and *wash* are by no means synonymous in their significations. It is manifest therefore that to wash with water, is not an expression which alludes to immersion.

6. *To be covered all over with any material, does not allude to or teach immersion.* If to be covered with any substance is immersion (*a*), then all persons are constantly immersed; for all are at all times covered with atmospheric air. This is essential to our very existence. In the ordinary course of Providence, no person could live long, if he was not covered with air. But if to be entirely covered with air, is to be immersed; then every person who has been baptized in any mode in the name of the Trinity, must, by immersers themselves, be admitted to be properly baptized. This they must acknowledge too, whether much or little water is used; or even if the words prescribed by our Saviour were used* and no water applied, they must then admit that valid baptism was administered, because at the time of the ceremony, they were entirely covered with air. If to be covered with air is immersion; and if immersion is baptism; then it necessarily follows that to be covered with air is baptism, if the proper form of words are used by a proper person. But immersers deny that such are baptized; and hence according to them, to be entirely covered with air is not to be immersed for baptism. Perhaps they would not admit, that to be entirely covered with sand or earth or

(*a*) See P. vii. Ch. 1, § 4. *See Mat. 28: 19.

smoke or fog, is to be immersed in their sense of the word. They would not then consider a person who had been covered with one of these as having been as properly baptized as if he had been covered entirely with water. If the practice of immersers may be taken as proof on this subject, we may conclude that by *immerse* they mean entirely covered with water; because, when they immerse persons, they always put the part of them, or at least of their clothes, not wet by themselves, entirely under water; never under sand, air, earth, smoke, fog or any other substance. It appears therefore that immersers, they themselves being judges, do not believe that immersion signifies to be covered with any substance. When therefore they take the ground that to be entirely covered with any thing, is immersion; they forsake their own exclusive notions, because they declare by their actions, that to be immersed, a person must be entirely covered with water. If therefore an individual should say that a body buried in the earth is immersed; he would by such an assertion, forsake the exclusive creed of immersers. Because, they, by their actions, say that to be covered with earth is not immersion; nor is it known that, in immersing a person, they ever cover him with earth. If to be entirely covered with any substance, is to be immersed; then the whole human race are constantly immersed, as they are at all times, entirely covered with air. But certainly such an immersion, or an immersion in smoke, or fog, or earth, could not teach or allude to the immersion entirely under water of the person so covered. It is certain that to be thus covered could not teach that immersion is baptism, or the only mode of baptism.

CHAPTER V.

IMMERSION NOT THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM.

1. *Christian baptism is mentioned in the word of God.* This fact is taught in the commission given by the Lord Jesus Christ to the disciples and their successors in the ministerial office. These are commanded to teach and baptize.* That they did baptize with water, in obedience to Christ's

*See Mat. 28: 19.

direction, is a fact often stated in scripture ; and that persons were commanded to receive the ordinance of baptism after his resurrection, is also too frequently mentioned to be denied by any person who believes the bible to be a revelation from God* (*a*). That the ordinance of christian baptism is mentioned in the book of God, is therefore an undeniable fact.

2. *Immersion is not, in the Scriptures, mentioned as a mode of baptism.* Any person who reads the word of God, can easily determine this point for himself. It is a mere matter of fact. If the word immerse or immersion is once recorded in the scriptures of truth, it can be found and the chapter and verse mentioned. The person who examines this subject, with the least degree of care, will soon discover that the much-loved word *immerse* is not, in the scriptures, used for baptism. Notwithstanding all the noise which has been made to induce persons to believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism ; God has not definitely taught mankind in his word that it is even one mode of administering that ordinance. It will be difficult to make men of sense believe that what is not so much as once mentioned in the whole word of God as baptism, is the only mode by which it can be administered.

3. *Immersion, as a mode of baptism, is not, by other language, definitely taught in the holy scriptures.* There is, in the word of God, no command for immersion (*b*) ; no example of immersion (*c*) ; no inferential evidence in favor of immersion (*d*) ; nor is there in the scriptures even a manifest allusion to immersion (*e*). This therefore cannot be the only mode of baptism. But though to sustain its claims, it has no authority from the word of God, no evidence in its favor either direct or indirect, from Divine truth ; yet immersion, with all the self-importance of an Eastern Despot, steps forth and demands to itself submission from all, as the only mode of baptism. It is so self-opinionated that it is not, (without any definitely expressed scriptural evidence of any kind in its favor,) satisfied to be allowed a standing as a mode of baptism. It even demands to be acknowledged as

*See Acts 2: 38. 41, and 8: 12. 13, and 10: 47 48, and 16: 15. 33, and 19: 5, and 22: 16, 1 Cor. 1: 13–17. (*a*) B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 2–5. (*b*) Ch. 1, § 1–8. (*c*) Ch. 2, § 1–4. (*d*) Ch. 3, § 1–10. (*e*) Ch. 4, § 1–6.

the only mode. Truly in this, the unfledged, unproved, unnamed thing (*a*), manifests no small amount of assurance.

4. *If any number of passages of Scripture stated expressly that immersion was baptism, and that persons were immersed for baptism, this would not prove immersion to be the only mode of baptism.* If one passage or ten or ten thousand, stated expressly that immersion was baptism, or a mode of baptism, then scriptural evidence would thereby be furnished to prove that immersion was baptism. But no number of declarations to prove immersion to be baptism, would prove it to be the only mode of baptism; or that nothing but immersion is baptism. If immersers could prove from the express language of scripture that immersion was baptism; the same express language of scripture, might prove that water applied in a different mode was baptism also. To prove the position therefore which the exclusive immersers always take, that immersion is the only mode of baptism; they must furnish proof to the point. They must first show by some express declaration of scripture, that immersion is baptism. This they cannot do, for this plain reason; there is no such passage recorded in God's book. And then after they have accomplished this impossibility; they have another to accomplish, which is not less difficult than the former. They have then to produce one passage of scripture or more to prove that immersion is the *only mode* of baptism. But no portion of the word of God, teaches explicitly that immersion is baptism (*b*); and much less that it is the only mode of baptism. So far therefore as Divine revelation is concerned; there is not the least intimation given to mankind to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

5. *If there is but one mode of baptism, that cannot be immersion.* That which is not expressly mentioned in the word of God, cannot be the only mode of baptism. Immersion is not thus mentioned; it cannot therefore be the only mode of baptism. In no portion of scripture, is immersion called a mode or the only mode of baptism. God, in one passage of his word, speaks of "one baptism;"* but in no portion of it, does he speak of *one mode* of baptism; and least

(*a*) It is as baptism, unnamed in the word of God. (*b*) Ch. 1, § 1–7, Ch. 2, § 1–4.
*Eph. 4: 5.

of all does he say that there is *only* one mode of baptism. But if there *is only one mode of baptism*, it is perfectly certain to those who take God's truth for their rule of duty in all religious matters, that immersion is not that mode. Those who read the scriptures know full well that Divine truth does not declare that immersion is a mode or the only mode of baptism. It is manifest to them that what is not once definitely named, in God's word, as baptism, either in the original or in any correct translation, cannot be the only way in which that ordinance is to be administered. What God does not plainly teach in his word, cannot be even a religious duty which men are, by Divine authority, required to observe. That immersion is not thus taught, is too manifest to be denied by any person who reads and believes what is revealed in God's word.

6. *Baptism in some mode may be explicitly revealed in the Holy Scriptures, though immersion as baptism is not so revealed.* Because the word *immerse* is not found in the translation of the scriptures into English ; it does not follow that no other word is used in them. Though immersion is not plainly taught therein ; other words may be used, which may teach a mode of baptism entirely different from immersion. And although no word in the original scriptures denoting immersion, is so much as once used for baptism or to define that word(*a*); yet words in the original languages of God's book may be used to teach another mode of baptism. It does not therefore follow that if there is no evidence to prove that immersion is baptism ; then no evidence can be found to prove that baptism may be administered in any other way. The point then to which the mind is brought on this subject, is ; *not* whether a person is to be immersed or not baptized ; but whether a person is to substitute immersion which is not mentioned in scripture as a mode of baptism, for that which is so mentioned ; and let this thing which as baptism, is totally nameless in the word of God, arrogate to itself the exclusive privilege of being the Divine ordinance of baptism !! From these remarks it can be seen of how much value is the assertion ; "If immersion is not the mode or the only mode of baptism, then there is no baptism."

(*a*) Ch. 1, § 5-7.

Would such persons really lay aside the word of God rather than their own beloved substitute for baptism? From the language they often use, it appears that at least some of them would.

CHAPTER VI.

IMMERSION FOR BAPTISM IMPROBABLE.

1. *It is not probable that persons were immersed in places where it is certain they were baptized.* (1.) John baptized "in Bethabara beyond Jordan."* There is no evidence that at or near this place, water sufficiently deep to immerse in, was found. That he immersed these, is without proof, and consequently improbable. (2.) He baptized "in Enon near to Salim."† In this place were several small springs rising out of the ground. These uniting formed one fountain several inches deep. From this flowed a small rivulet. But here was no water so deep that in it an adult person might be immersed(*a*). Grown persons could not therefore be immersed in Enon, unless a suitable place was constructed for that purpose. And, as not the least hint is given us that such an artificial receptacle was formed in which to immerse; so, that he immersed in Enon is not probable. Besides, the Jordan is so near Enon, as to render the labor of constructing an artificial cistern sufficiently large to immerse in, entirely useless. The Jordan and Enon are only a few miles apart. It would therefore have been much more convenient for persons to have gone that short distance, than to have made an artificial cistern in which to immerse. But the word of God does not intimate that any thing of the kind was done; and the work of God in creating a number of small springs at Enon, shows that if persons were immersed there, an artificial cistern of some kind must have been provided. To fancy, therefore, that John immersed at Enon must be an exceedingly improbable conjecture. (3.) He baptized "in the wilderness"‡ (*b*). No evidence can be found in the word of God or in his works to prove that living water in any quantity was found in the wilderness where John baptized. It is exceedingly improbable that water in

*John 1: 28, and 10: 40. †John 3: 23. *(a)* See Jerome; Sandy; Sacred Geography. ‡Mark 1: 4. *(b)* See Dr. Ryland's Candid Statement.

sufficient quantities to immerse, was carried away into this wilderness; and that he immersed there is therefore equally improbable. (4.) Baptism was administered in various parts of Palestine, and probably in all seasons of the year. But, as all the streams in that country except the Jordan, dry up in summer(*a*); so it is very improbable that immersion was the mode or the only mode of baptism there practiced. (5.) Baptism was administered in "the way" between "Jerusalem and Gaza(*b*), which is desert." A rivulet rises some distance from this way or road. It runs a short distance and loses itself in the sand. This stream is only a few inches deep. It is also quite narrow. It is seldom or never much increased by freshets. This is the largest, or rather the only stream on this route from Jerusalem to Gaza(*c*). The language of inspiration intimates that the stream was not only small, but very small. It is this. "As" Philip and the Eunuch "went on their way, they came" (επι τι υδωρ) "to" or upon "a certain water." It was so small that, even in that country where the little mountain torrents were frequently named; this stream had no distinctive appellation. It was not known by any name. They called it "a certain water." It was so small that they came (επι) upon it before they observed it. They came upon it unexpectedly. This appears from the expression of delightful astonishment made by the Eunuch when he saw the water; "See, here is water;" (ιδου υδωρ) or behold, water.* The stream was so small that it had no distinctive name; it was not even known by the Ethiopian Eunuch. Indeed, the expression (τι υδωρ) in Greek, translated "a certain water," is diminutive, and elegantly expresses a small stream which had no distinctive name appropriated to it. In this little stream, the Eunuch could not have been immersed, unless a pit had been dug in the sand, or the water raised by a dam (*d*). It is not likely that he and Philip either dug a hole in the sand so large that when filled with water immersion could be performed, or erected a dam across it so high that immersion might be possible. It is certain that God has left us no evidence in his word that they did or attempted to do either. Besides, if immersion

(a) See Un. B. Dic. Art. Jordan, &c. *(b)* This place is 60 miles south west of Jerusalem, and about 20 from the Mediterranean Sea. *(c)* See Sacred Geography. *Acts 8: 36 in Greek and English. *(d)* See Jerome on the passage p. 41, Sandy's Travels, B. 2, p. 142, and other travels through Palestine.

had been necessary to baptism in the Eunuch's case, it would have been much more convenient for him to have gone to the Jordan, or to the river of Egypt, than to have prepared, in that little brook, a place in which he could have been immersed. It is therefore not at all probable that the Eunuch was baptized by immersion. (6.) The jailer "was baptized" in the Philippian prison. He had "thrust" Paul and Silas "into the inner prison," and "made their feet fast in the stocks." At "midnight" they "prayed and sang praises to God." By an earthquake "the foundations of the the prison were shaken." The "prison doors were opened." The jailer was alarmed; "sprang in" to the inner prison where Paul and Silas were; fell down before them; "brought them out" of the inner prison; enquired what he should do to be saved; was directed to believe in Christ; "the same hour of the night" he "washed their stripes—was baptized," and "brought them into his house."* From this account, it is evident that the jailer was baptized in the prison, though not in the cells into which Paul and Silas had been thrust; and that after his baptism, he took them to his own apartment. It is not said or intimated that they went out of the prison or to a river. Nor is it probable that a jailer, under the Roman Government, would, at midnight, take his prisoners out of the prison-house to a stream to be immersed by one of them. Moreover, it is certain that Paul and Silas did not go out of the prison that night. This is clear from the fact that they would not leave it the next morning, though permitted to do so, until "the magistrates—came and—brought them out†." If they had been out already *without* permission from the magistrates, it would have been mere trifling to refuse to come out again *with* their permission. Paul and Silas were not guilty of such an inconsistency. Not the least hint is given us in the account that they passed the prison-gate till the magistrates came and brought them out. By doing this they publicly acknowledged that the imprisonment of Paul and Silas had been undeserved according to the Roman law. There is, therefore, no evidence that these servants of Christ took the jailer to a river at midnight to baptize him, but positive evidence to the contrary. Besides, not a word was said of a cistern in the prison. Indeed, to suppose that a government,

*Acts 16: 24-34. †Acts 16: 37-39.

cruel as that of Pagan Rome, would keep a bath in the prison to promote the happiness of those whom it often incarcerated without a crime, and, in sport, tossed to the ravenous wild beast, would not only be improbable, but would crown the climax of absurdity. But since he was not taken out to a river, and since there is not the least probability that there was a cistern in the prison, it is exceedingly improbable that the jailer was immersed.

2. *It is not probable that the Jews always immersed themselves before their meals.* That they were accustomed to ceremonially wash or baptize themselves before meals is clearly taught in the word of God. A "certain Pharisee besought" our Saviour "to dine with him." He accordingly "went in and sat down to meat; and when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed" (εβαπτισθη) or baptized, "before dinner;" and again it is said of "all the Jews," "when they come from the market, except they wash," (βαπτισωνται) or baptize, "they eat not."* It was therefore the custom of the Jews to baptize or wash themselves before eating their ordinary meals. It is by no means probable that they always or generally immersed themselves before they eat, or when they returned from market. Besides, the custom of the Jews was to wash or baptize themselves for these their ceremonial purifications, in "waterpots of stone—containing two or three firkins apiece"† or less than twenty-five gallons each. There is not, therefore, the least probability that, when they washed or baptized themselves in these before their meals or when they came from market, the act of ablution was by immersion.

3. *Persons did not leave the place where they applied for baptism in order to receive that ordinance.* This may be easily learned from the facts relating to this point. Persons are oftened mentioned as being baptized in the same place where they heard the gospel. This was the fact with "both men and women" who were baptized; of Paul, who "arose and was baptized;" of "Cornelius—and his friends;" of "Lydia—and her household;" of "the jailer and all his;" of the twelve men who were "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;" and of John who "did baptize—and preach"

*Luke 11: 37. 38, Mark 7: 3. 4 in Greek. †John 2: 6.

in the same place.* As persons heard the gospel, believed, and without changing their location, were baptized, it is certainly improbable that they were always taken away to some river, pond or cistern, to be immersed; and that this circumstance should not be so much as once mentioned in the word of God. If persons were always immersed for baptism, then there must have been water of sufficient depth for this purpose where they were immersed. This deep water must have been where they heard the gospel and applied for baptism, or they must have gone to some water deep enough for the purposes of immersion. There is no proof in the word of God or elsewhere that either was the case. Men who believe that for which they have good evidence, cannot believe without the least evidence that deep water was always found at the very spot where persons asked to be baptized, or that they always went to places where such deep water was to be obtained.

4. *It is not probable that persons are required to be immersed in places where they are required to be baptized.* Christ commands his ministering servants to "teach all nations, baptizing them".† All nations are therefore to be taught and baptized. It may be remarked then, (1.) that the inhabitants of Greenland, Iceland, Labrador, Norway, Lapland, and other nothern regions, are to be baptized. In many of these countries, in order to immerse, a hole must be cut through the ice. This, in high latitudes, for more than half the year, is from ten to fifty feet thick. Moreover for months in succession, the cold is so intense, that in a very few minutes, perhaps two or three, after a hole was cut in the ice, the water would again be frozen over. It is not probable that all adult persons, even delicate females, are required to be immersed in these bleak regions. Even in the more temperate climates of Europe, Asia and America (*a*), it is not probable that a merciful God would require weakly or sickly persons to be put entirely under water in extremely freezing weather. (2.) In many regions of Asia and Africa, water in sufficient quantities to immerse an adult person in, cannot be found in traveling hundreds of miles (*a*). It is certainly very improbable that Mercy would require persons,

*Acts 8: 12. and 10: 24. 47. 48, and 16: 14. 15. 33, and 19: 5. 7, Mark 1: 4. †Mat. 28: 19. (*a*) See the Geography of all these regions.

especially the feeble or sick, to make a journey of several hundred miles merely to be immersed. But in all these countries, persons are commanded to be baptized.

5. *It is very improbable that those who were "baptized for the dead"* were immersed.* This baptism *for* the dead is mentioned as a proof of the resurrection *from* the dead. In immersion a living person is put under the water. This could not prove that a dead person was to be restored to life by Almighty power. Besides, the original word (υπερ) rendered "*for*" literally denotes "*above.*" It is not probable that a cistern was made above the dead in which to immerse the living. It is very improbable, therefore, that living persons were immersed when they were baptized for or *above* the dead.

6. *Facts show that immersion is not, in all probability, the only mode of baptism.* (1.) *It is a fact*, that the claim of immersion to be the only mode of baptism, unchurches a very large portion of professing christians. Let a Universalist, a Unitarian, a Deist, an Infidel, a Pantheist, an Atheist, and the most devoted christian, present themselves at the Communion Table of many immersers; and each would receive the same treatment. Each would be debarred. Not one of them would be allowed to taste the crumbs that might fall from the Lord's table. And why is this devoted christian put on a level with the Atheist? Why? Simply because he has not been immersed as a substitute for baptism; because he has not taken that for the Divine ordinance of baptism, which is not so much as once named in the whole word of God. All professing christians, save the immersed, and even some of them, are thus unchurched. They are, so far as external ordinances are concerned, put by many immersers, on a par with Atheists. There are in the world more than one hundred and seventy-five millions of professing christians. Of these, about one million maintain that immersion is the only mode of baptism. All these persons have or may have the same Bible. Nearly half of them profess to be guided by its instructions in all religious duties. Now, it is certainly very improbable that in a matter, where the intellect only is concerned, but one out of more than a hundred, should be right, and all the others

*1 Cor. 15:29 in Greek.

wrong. And this must be the case, if immersion and that only, is baptism. (2.) *It is a fact*, that many of those denominations of professing christians, which do not admit that immersion is the only mode of baptism, require their public teachers of religion to be thoroughly educated men. They require them to be particularly well versed in Hebrew and Greek, the languages in which the scriptures were originally written (*a*). It is not probable that all these men, thoroughly educated for the ministry, should be entirely mistaken in relation to the mode of applying water in baptism. (3.) *It is a fact*, that no denomination which maintains that immersion is the only mode of baptism, does now, or ever did, require their ministry to be thoroughly educated men. Many of their preachers have not even a good English education. They frequently speak of learning in a minister as useless or even pernicious. It is not probable then that one such uneducated preacher should be wiser than ten, twenty, fifty or a hundred, educated men, in relation to the mode of baptism. (4.) *It is a fact*, that almost all errorists who baptize, adopt immersion as one of their modes, if not as the only mode of baptism. Errors are generally found in clusters. When therefore a number of uneducated errorists uniformly adopt immersion as their mode of baptism; and more than ten times as many sound educated men, as uniformly adopt a different mode, and turn aside from theirs; it becomes exceedingly improbable that immersion is the only mode of baptism (*b*). Indeed, among those who profess to take the word of God for their only rule of duty in religious matters; immersion for baptism usually assumes an importance in proportion to their love of human, instead of Divine authority. Accurate knowledge of the holy scriptures, and habitual obedience to the positive commands of Zion's King, are by no means distinguishing marks of most immersers. It is not probable therefore that a few uneducated errorists, should habitually blunder on to the proper mode of baptism; while large numbers of men of good judge-

(*a*) Of those who are particularly strenuous in the education of their ministry, the Associate, the Associate Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, the Reformed Presbyterian Churches, &c., may be named.

(*b*) Of errorists who adopt immersion as their mode of baptism, the Anabaptists, Sabbatarians, Dunkards, Free Will Baptists, Quaker-Baptists, Chrystians, Campbellites, Millerites, Mormons, Universalists, and more than thirty other classes, may be mentioned.

ment, extensive learning, scriptural piety, and of those who are conscientious in obeying God's commands in other respects, should adopt that for baptism which the scriptures do not sanction as such. If these thus act, they are substituting the inventions of men for a Divine ordinance, and are therefore living habitually in the practice of solemn mockery, if not of practical blasphemy!! That this should be the case, is certainly improbable. (5.) *It is a fact*, that in the year 1607, forty-seven of the best linguists in England began to translate the scriptures (*a*). They had all the advantages to assist them in their work, that Great Britain could afford. They spent three years in completing the present translation of the word of God. In the whole of this translation, they did not once say or intimate that the original word for baptize signifies immerse. They did not, in a single instance, give immerse as the *only*, or even as *one* meaning, of the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize. It is not probable that all these forty-seven men, should spend three years in translating the holy scriptures, and not ascertain in a single instance the only proper meaning of the word for baptize. It is not probable that they should all be mistaken as to the meaning of that one word. It is also equally improbable that any one man should be so much wiser than these forty-seven, that without any thing like their advantages, he should be more likely to ascertain the proper meaning of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize than all these forty-seven men. It is not likely that one man even if he were wise, should be wiser than forty-seven of the wisest men that England could produce in the year 1607. Moreover, it is not probable that a man who does not know one of the original letters from another, and who can scarcely read his mother tongue intelligently, should be more able to determine the exact meaning of the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, than all these forty-seven together. Facts therefore show that the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism, is very improbable

7. *It is not probable that to baptize, a large quantity of water is necessary.* Baptism is a significant ordinance (*b*). It symbolizes the work of God's Spirit on the souls of the

(*a*) See Marsh Eccle. Hist. 5th Ed. 1836, p. 334, 335, and other Eccle. Hists. (*b*) Bk. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9.

truly converted, when, in regeneration, he applies to them the atoning blood of Christ. A large quantity of water is not necessary for this purpose. Neither scripture nor reason teaches that water enough to immerse the body is necessary to symbolize the purification of the soul from sin. It is not probable therefore, that this quantity is required or was always used for baptism.

8. *It is not probable that tables or couches upon which persons formerly reclined at meals, were immersed.* These were so large that at least twelve persons might recline at once on one of them while they were eating together. The "washing" of these "tables" is, in the original, expressly called (βαπτισμους) the baptizing of them.* Now it is entirely improbable that these tables or couches (*a*) were immersed every time they were washed or baptized. It is therefore utterly improbable that baptize always means immerse, or that immersion and that only, is baptism.

CHAPTER VII.

IMMERSION FOR BAPTISM IMPOSSIBLE.

1. *The Lord Jesus Christ would not require baptism to be administered in such a way as to destroy life.* To imagine that he would, is to suppose that he would act totally inconsistent with his character. He "came not to destroy men's lives, but to save." He "was holy, harmless," and "undefiled." To imagine therefore that he would direct his ministering servants to baptize in such a mode as to violate the command, "Thou shalt not kill,"† would be to suppose that he would act inconsistent with himself. That he would thus act, is impossible; because to do so would be inconsistent with his Divine nature. The commission, "Go ye—and teach all nations, baptizing them,"‡ includes persons in every state or condition in life. It therefore includes the sick, whatever may be their disease. To immerse or put entirely under water, especially in winter, those who are in certain stages of some diseases (*b*), would destroy life almost as

*See Mark 7: 4, John 13: 22. 23. 28 in Greek. *(a)* These were used for sleeping on at night and for eating from during the day. Hence they may be called either tables or couches; see Greek Lexicons on (κλινη) and κλινω.) †Ex. 20: 13. ‡Mat. 28: 19. *(b)* Such as the yellow, spotted, putrid and some other fevers.

soon as poison. Humanity shudders at the very idea of killing a sick person by immersion. And if that is the only mode of baptism, then immersers must destroy life by this act or some diseased persons cannot obey the command which requires them to be "baptized." To command all the sick in every stage of every disease and at any season of the year to be immersed, is manifestly inconsistent with the character of him who "will have mercy and not sacrifice." He does not, in the case of any diseased person, dispense with obedience for a single day, whatever may be the degree or nature of his complaint. No person, however severe the cold may be, is authorized by the word of God to defer his baptism for any length of time, till his health is restored. In the scriptures no direction is given by which an individual is required, authorized or even permitted, to defer his baptism in consequence of disease. If it is impossible for believers in Divine revelation, to suppose that Christ would require his ministers to destroy life in the administration of this ordinance, it is equally impossible for such to believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism. The opinion that death has been caused or hastened and disease induced by immersion, is not mere theory. Instances are known where both these evils have resulted from putting the bodies of diseased persons and others under water for baptism. The command, "Thou shalt not kill," stands in the way, therefore, of the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

2. *It is impossible for a person to be immersed while standing.* Paul was directed to "arise and be baptized;" and it is expressly stated that he "arose and was baptized."* To be immersed, a person must be laid down on his face or on his back in the water, and then thrust under the element; or he must kneel down in it and be turned over forward till he is entirely covered with the water. Some immersers adopt one of these modes and some another, as their fancies or leaders may dictate. But none of them ever think of rising up to be immersed; this impossibility they have not yet attempted. It is, therefore, as impossible for immersion to be the only scriptural mode of baptism, as it would be for Paul or others to be immersed while standing.

*Acts 22: 16, and 9: 18.

3. *A person cannot be immersed by applying water to him.* In every mode of immersion, and in every case, the person is applied to the water, and not the water to the person. No class of immersers, however their fancies may lead them into absurdities, have yet attempted to immerse persons by applying water to them. But wherever in the word of God this matter is mentioned, water is spoken of as being applied to the person baptized; and in no one instance is the person represented as being applied to the water. John, it is said, "baptized with water"* (*a*); but in no instance is it said that he applied persons to or put them under the water. Peter says, "can any man forbid water that" Cornelius and his friends "should not be baptized?"† not, can any man forbid these to be put under water? As water is applied to the person in baptism, and as it is impossible to immerse by applying water to any one, so it is therefore impossible for immersion to be the only mode of baptism. The use of the preposition *with* after the word baptize excludes the possibility of immersion being the only mode of administering that ordinance. "With water" does not signify *under water.* The word *with* never denotes *under* or below the surface. When therefore God in his word declares that baptism "with water" was practiced, he teaches, by such language, that immersion was not the mode. Indeed, the language used shows that in such instances immersion could not have been the mode. The original word (ἐν) translated *with*, often denotes *at*, sometimes *in*, and occasionally it has other significations; but in the Greek language it does not signify below the surface or under water. When, therefore, it is said of a man; he baptized (ἐν) "with water," it is certain that the language teaches that water is by him applied in baptism to persons, and not the persons to the water. It is also certain that to baptize "with water" cannot be immersion; because to immerse is not to baptize "with water." It is to put or have the person go entirely under that element. To those who are baptized "with water," the fluid is applied. Such baptism cannot be immersion; for in this last the person is invariably applied to the water, not the water to him.

4. *It is impossible to immerse persons on dry ground.*

*Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16, John 1: 26, 33. (*a*) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 3, § 6.
†Acts 10: 47.

This is so manifest that no one ever thinks of making the attempt. Nor could any person who had no favorite scheme to defend, ever imagine it possible to put an individual entirely under water on dry ground. The Israelites in escaping from Egyptian bondage passed through the Red Sea. God opened a passage for them. This must have been at least forty rods wide. This opening in the sea was "dry ground;" from this the waters had retired and stood as a wall on either hand. Almost every conceivable form of expression is used in God's word, to show that this opening in the sea, through which the Israelites passed, was not covered with water to the depth of a single inch. The fact that the ground on this opening in the midst of the sea was dry, is frequently stated. In six different places this opening on which the Israelites are said to have passed through the sea, is called "dry land;" and in two others it is called "dry ground."* It is also said, in relation to this opening: "the channels of the sea appeared;" God said "to the deep, be dry;" He "dried the sea"—and "made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over;" the "Red Sea was dried up, so he led" his people "through the depths as through the wilderness;" they "went through the flood on foot;" he "divided the Red Sea into parts;" and speaking of the remnant of God's people, the prophet says of them, they shall go over "the tongue of the Egyptian sea—dry-shod—as—Israel—came up out of the land of Egypt."† This opening, therefore, in the Red Sea, through which the Israelites passed in escaping from Egyptian bondage, was "dry land"—"dry ground"—a "way"—like "the wilderness"—was "dry"—was "dried"—"appeared" to the eye; and they went over it "on foot"—as they did "through the wilderness, dry-shod." No language can present more pointed proof that the Israelites "walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea." But while in the midst of the sea on this dry land, they "were all baptized" (εις) "unto Moses."‡ Here then the whole Hebrew nation were baptized on the "dry ground" on which they passed through the sea. But it is impossible to immerse persons on "dry ground;"

*Ex. 14: 16. 21. 22. 29, and 15: 19, Neh. 9: 11, Ps. 66: 6, Heb. 11: 29. †2 Sam. 22: 16, Josh. 4: 23, Isa. 44: 27, and 51: 10, Ps. 106: 9, and 66: 6, and 136: 13, Isa. 11: 15. 16. ‡1 Cor. 10: 2.

therefore it was impossible for these Israelites who were baptized on "dry ground" to have been immersed; and consequently immersion, as the only mode of baptism, is impossible. They were also baptized "in the cloud."* But before the sea was divided, "the cloud went from before—and stood behind them." It thus "came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel."† In passing from the front to the rear of Israel's camp, the cloud "poured out water."‡ In this way they were baptized "in" (εν) or with "the cloud"(*a*). But to be baptized with water falling out of a cloud in drops, is certainly not immersion. And every one knows, that when a cloud pours down water, it comes in drops. Nor did the cloud return and spread itself over the Israelites, after they had entered the sea; so that the cloud might be over them and the sea on either hand. There is not the least intimation in the word of God, that the cloud was spread over the Hebrews while they were "in the midst of the sea." But if it had been, this would have been a singular kind of immersion. The walls of water, as Israel passed through the sea, were more than forty rods apart, and eighty feet or more high. Persons in the midst of this passage would have been at least twenty rods from water, instead of being immersed in or put entirely under the fluid. Besides, at this very time, they were on "dry ground" and "dry-shod." In such an immersion, a drop of water could not touch a person, except the exceedingly small particles of spray from the sea. If the Israelites, before they entered the opening made for them in the Red Sea, had been surrounded with the cloud, only particles of mist would have rested upon them. This baptism in or with a cloud, where only drops of rain or mist could fall on them, was such as to render immersion in that case impossible. As to immerse on dry ground, or with drops falling from a cloud is impossible, so this baptism "unto Moses" in (εν) or with "the cloud and in" (εν) or with "the sea," could not possibly have been immersion.

5. *It is impossible for a person to immerse himself or be immersed in a vessel containing less than twenty-five gallons.* It was the custom of the Jews to perform their ceremonial

*1 Cor. 10: 2. †Ex. 14: 19. 20. ‡Ps. 77: 17. (*a*) B. ii, P. i, Ch. 3, § 6.

purifications in stone "water-pots"—"containing two or three firkins apiece"*(a). These might contain from one to twenty-three gallons each. Of these purifications of the Jews, it is said, "except they wash" (βαπτισωνται) or baptize, as it is in the original, "they eat not." That the Jews were accustomed to wash or baptize before their ordinary meals, is manifest from the fact that the Pharisee "marveled" because our Savior had not "washed," (εβαπτισθη) or baptized "before dinner."† Had the omission to wash before meals been customary, the Pharisee would not have "marveled" when he observed the Lord Jesus Christ sitting down at the table without attending to this traditionary ceremonial observance. It is manifest therefore that the Jews were accustomed to wash or purify themselves ceremonially before they ate their ordinary meals. These their ceremonial washings are in the original expressly called baptisms. When it is said of these purifications, they "wash" or "washed," the Greek word for baptize or baptized is used.† But they were accustomed to wash or baptize themselves in "water-pots of stone," containing, at the very most, less than twenty-five gallons*(a)*. That these baptisms or washings were by immersion, is, therefore, as impossible, as it would be to immerse a full-grown man in a vessel containing not less than one, or more than twenty-three gallons. It is perfectly manifest that an adult person could not possibly be immersed in such a vessel. But as the washing of adults in these water-pots, is called baptism, so it is perfectly certain that this baptism in these pots, not greatly exceeding in size a half-barrel, and perhaps much less, could not possibly be immersion; and that, therefore, immersion cannot possibly be the only scriptural mode of baptism.

6. *Without a miracle, it would be impossible for one man to immerse five thousand persons each day for five hundred days in succession.* The time which intervened between the commencement of John's public ministry and its close, did not much, if any, exceed a year and a half. During this time, "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan—were baptized of him." These, with those he

*John 2: 6. *(a)* A firkin is a Greek measure. Its exact capacity is not known. It did not however contain less than one gallon, nor more than seven and a half. Perhaps different firkins were of different sizes. †Mark 7: 4, Luke 11: 38 in Greek.

baptized "in the wilderness" — "in Bethabara beyond Jordan," and in "Enon, near to Salim,"* must, as the language indicates, include a very large portion of the inhabitants of that country. The whole population of that land, at that time, did not fall short of five millions. John must have baptized at least one half of these. The language used cannot well express a less proportion. His public ministry continued about five hundred days. To have baptized two and a half millions in this short time, he must have baptized five thousand persons each day in succession for the whole five hundred days. Without a miracle it was absolutely impossible for one man to have immersed this number, or even one thousand daily, for so long a time. But "John did no miracle;"† and yet he baptized a "multitude," which would nearly or quite, or more than equal five thousand each day during his whole public ministry. John baptized more than it was possible for one man to immerse while he was engaged in his ministry; therefore, that his baptism was by immersion is impossible.

7. *Twelve men could not immerse three thousand persons in about five hours.* Peter "with the eleven" began his discourse to the Jews "at the third hour of the day;"‡ or about nine o'clock in the morning. After he had spoken some time, they said to him, "and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren what shall we do?" Peter answered this inquiry, and "with many other words," he exhorted them.§ How much time was spent in these discourses we are not informed. But we cannot suppose that after all these exercises more than five hours of the day remained. Peter and "the eleven" are the only persons mentioned as being, on this occasion, engaged either in preaching or baptizing. There is no evidence that the seventy disciples were there; and if they had been, they had no authority to baptize; for Christ, when he sent them out, did not authorize them to administer baptism.‖ In part of a day, these twelve baptized "about three thousand,"§ or about two hundred and fifty each. If these were immersed, and four minutes, a shorter time than immersers usually occupy in performing the ceremony, be allowed to put each person under water, it would have requi-

*Mat. 3: 5. 6. Mark 1: 4. 5. John 1: 28, and 3: 23. †John 10: 41. ‡Acts 2: 14. 15. §See Acts 2: 37. 38. 40. 41. 42. ‖See Luke 10: 1–11.

red more than sixteen hours to have immersed the whole three thousand. Without a miracle, no twelve men could immerse three thousand persons in part of a day. In this case we have no evidence that a miracle was performed or was necessary. Immersers cannot deny that the three thousand were baptized in part of a day; for "the same day," they were received into "fellowship" with the apostles.* According to most of them, the only door into christian fellowship and of the "breaking of bread"* in the Lord's supper, is immersion. That the three thousand therefore were baptized on that day, before or at the time they were received into fellowship, no exclusive immerser can deny or doubt. Besides, at or near "Jerusalem,"† where these three thousand were baptized, there is no stream, pond or brook, sufficiently large to immerse an adult person in (*a*); and the hatred of the chief priests and other Jews to christianity and to the apostles, would not allow them to permit the pools, (if they were deep enough, or the public cisterns, if any such existed and were suitable,) to be used for the administration of the ordinance of baptism. The Jewish rulers would not allow the apostles to occupy in peace, even their own private apartments for religious purposes.‡ Certainly then, these Jews would not allow them to use for such purposes, any water over which they could exercise control. It is therefore manifest, (1.) That, as these three thousand were all baptized in part of a day, and as it was impossible for them to be immersed by twelve men in so short a time; so it is impossible for the baptism of these to have been by immersion. (2.) It was impossible for the apostles, at that time, to immerse at Jerusalem even if they had been so disposed; for the Jewish rulers who had just before "crucified the Lord of glory,"§ had then both the will and the power to prevent them from doing so. And those who so sincerely hated every thing holy, as they did, could not, consistently with their hatred, have, either directly or indirectly, encouraged the apostles in the practice of any part of their religious duties. (3.) At or near Jerusalem, there was no water deep enough to immerse in. To suppose therefore that the three thousand persons

*Acts 2: 41. 42. †Luke 24: 47. 49, Acts 1: 4. 8. 12. 13, and 2: 1. 5. 14. 36. 38. 41. 42. (*a*) See Sacred Geography. ‡See John 20: 19. 26. §1 Cor. 2: 8.

added to the church on the day of Pentecost, were immersed is to suppose an absolute impossibility.

8. *To be immersed into death on the cross is impossible.* Christ died on the cross. When therefore true believers "are buried with him by baptism into death;" they are "baptized into" (εἰς) "his death" on the cross.* It is impossible for baptism into such a death to be immersion. Death on the cross is produced by elevating the person above the earth; and in immersion, the person goes or is put entirely under water. No two things can be more unlike than death by crucifixion and immersion. It is therefore impossible for that baptism which is into the death of Christ on the cross to be immersion.

9. *That baptism which is a figure of Noah's preservation in the ark, cannot be immersion.* Noah and his family were preserved from being overwhelmed by the universal deluge, by being carried in the ark "on the face" or surface "of the waters,"† not by being immersed in them. The baptism then which is a "figure"‡ of their preservation, cannot be immersion. They were saved from being destroyed in the flood, because they were in the ark above the waters, not because they were thrust under their surface(*a*). It is impossible therefore for immersion to be the mode of baptism which figuratively represents the preservation of Noah and his family from the deluge. Immersion or going under water, cannot be a "figure" of sailing in the ark above or "on the face of the waters." What a wild fancy that man must have, who can suppose that being in the ark "on the face of the waters," is symbolized by putting the body of a person entirely under their surface!!

10. *That baptism which is a seal cannot be immersion.* A seal never covers the whole, nor even the greater part of what is sealed. The size of a seal does not effect its binding force. Whether it is large or small, so long as it is a seal, its binding force remains the same. But if the whole or even the greater part of the instrument intended to be sealed is covered with the sealing material; its validity, instead of being confirmed, would thereby be destroyed. To cover a deed or bond or mortgage or will, with wax or wafers, would

*Rom. 6: 3, 4. †Gen. 7: 18. ‡1 Pet. 3: 20. 21. (*a*) See Ch. 4, § 4.

not confirm but destroy its validity. That to cover it thus with the sealing material would destroy the binding force of the seal, is too manifest to need farther illustration. Christian baptism is a seal (*a*). It confirms the promise of blessings to the person baptized. As a seal cannot wholly cover the thing sealed; so immersion, as in it, the immersed are covered all over with water the sealing material, cannot be a seal to them. Immersion destroys the very nature of a seal; because in it the persons intended to be sealed, are entirely covered with the sealing material. It is impossible therefore for immersion to be that baptism which is a seal.

11. *Baptism "with the Holy Ghost" cannot be immersion.* In immersion the body is put entirely under water. In baptism "with the Holy Ghost,"* the Spirit of God operates on the soul in his regenerating power or in his miraculous gifts or in both(*b*). In regeneration, neither soul nor body is immersed; but *in* the subjects of this gracious operation a new nature, a new heart, spiritual life, all the christian graces and affections, are produced by that "Divine power" which gives to God's people "all things that pertain unto life and godliness."† In baptism with the Holy Ghost, therefore, when the expression denotes regeneration, nothing like the entire submersion of either soul or body in water or in any thing else, is mentioned. No person surely, can imagine that the regeneration of the soul, is the immersion of the body.

Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is an expression which also denotes his miraculous powers, especially the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost. The disciples were thus "baptized" not "many days" after the resurrection of Christ.‡ When they received this miraculous baptism; "there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting." "Cloven tongues" then "sat upon each of them"—"and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost," not immersed in the Spirit; and then they "began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."§ The apostles in this baptism were "filled with the Holy Ghost;" and the cloven tongues or the fire or the sound "sat upon each of them." It was

(*a*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11. *Mat. 3: 11, Acts 1: 5, (*b*)See B. i, P. v, Ch. 1, § 2. †2 Pet. 1: 3. ‡Acts 1: 5. §Acts 2: 2–4.

impossible for them at that time to have been immersed in the Spirit; because they were then filled with the Spirit or the Spirit was in them. Nor is it said or intimated that they were entirely covered with the Spirit. The tongues sat upon them; the sound like that of a mighty wind, came "from heaven" into the house; so that into these there could be no immersion; and if there was, it would not be immersion into the Spirit, but into sound or wind. But no man can imagine, that to be baptized with sound or wind, if such a thing was mentioned, is the same as to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. God, in no passage of his word, says any thing of baptism with sound or wind. Besides, they were not put into the sound or wind; but the sound, like that of a rushing wind, came into and filled the house in which they were. As the sound or wind filled the house, the disciples might have been surrounded with one or both of these; but this would be essentially different from immersion; and it would be impossible for any person to suppose that sound or wind resting on them, was baptism with the Holy Ghost. When baptism with the Spirit, signifies his miraculous influences; it simply intimates that God works miracles of some kind by the persons thus baptized. In this baptism, Divine power is exercised through those who are thus enabled to work miracles. But that the baptism in which the Spirit entered the apostles, or by which they were enabled to work miracles, or by the influence of which persons are truly regenerated, is immersion or the putting of the body entirely under water, is not only impossible, but absolutely absurd.

12. *Baptism "with fire" cannot be immersion.* The expression, "baptism—with fire"* when used of christians, may denote the purifying influence of the blood of Christ applied to the soul by the Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification. But whether this is or is not the true import of the expression; it is certain that it cannot mean the immersion of the body in water. To baptize "with fire" cannot signify to cover the body with water. Fire and water are opposite elements; to be baptized with fire therefore cannot signify to be immersed or covered entirely with water.

13. *The baptism of our Saviour with sufferings in the gar-*

*Mat. 3: 11, Luke 3: 16.

den of Gethsemane and on the cross, could not have been by immersion. The Lord Jesus Christ speaking of these sufferings, says; "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished."* When he was suffering in the garden; he said, "my soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." Here "his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." He "fell on his face" in prayer while enduring the wrath of God in behalf of sinners.† But in all this baptism with sufferings, there is nothing that resembles immersion; nothing that renders it possible that, in receiving this baptism, his body was entirely covered with water. No one can imagine that while he was baptized with suffering on the cross, his body was taken down from the tree and immersed in water. The baptism of Christ with sufferings could not then have been by immersion; because this his baptism was anguish of soul, not the application of water to the body. It is impossible for such a baptism to be by immersion.

14. *That which is indecent, cannot be the only mode of baptism.* In Christ's kingdom "all things" must "be done decently and in order."‡ But in immersion are many things so indecent that to them, modest females could not easily be induced to submit, if their minds were pointedly directed to them. A few of these may be noticed here. (1.) The immersed wade up to the waist in water. (2.) They are laid down flat in the water. (3.) The dress of females often floats on the surface of the element. (4.) The wet dress adheres to the limbs of females in a very indecent manner, while they are walking out of and returning from the water. Such indecent practices cannot be indispensable to an ordinance of Christ's church; where "all things" must "be done decently" as well as "in order." Many indecencies formerly practiced by immersers are too gross to be mentioned here.

15. *That cannot be the only mode of baptism, which agitates the mind and renders it for the time unfit for serious thought and solemn devotion.* That immersion does this, every one knows who has been suddenly put entirely under water. By the act of immersing a person, his ears and nose

*Luke 12: 50. See also Mat. 20: 22. 23, Mark 10: 38, 39. †Mat. 26: 36. 38, 39, Mark 14: 32–35, Luke 22: 41. ‡1 Cor. 14: 40.

are filled with water. During the time his head is below the surface, he cannot breathe. While this part of the ceremony is in progress, the person can have no serious devotional exercises. The expectation of being submerged, agitates the person more or less. Wet garments must, after immersion, be removed and their places supplied with others. This always and almost necessarily follows immersion. All these and similar exercises are very far from being consistent with the solemnity of a Divine ordinance As therefore immersion agitates the mind, is inconsistent with solemnity and turns away the thoughts from God and devotion, at, and for a time after, the person is put under the water ; so it cannot possibly be, that Divine wisdom has adopted that as the only mode of baptism. God acts consistently with himself. He does not command men to offer him solemn service and devout worship, in *that*, the very performance of which destroys solemnity and devotion. If any person is not convinced that immersion does this, he can satisfy himself of the fact by going suddenly under water.

16. *It is impossible for that baptism which denotes the Old Testament washings, to be immersion.* These washings are collectively called (βαπτισμοις) baptisms.* In the whole Old Testament scriptures, where these various ceremonial washings are very frequently mentioned, they are not once called immersions. When the mode of these is mentioned, it is not in any case said to be by immersion. For one who takes the word of God for his only rule in all religious duties, to believe that these baptisms which are *never called* immersions in Divine revelation, were *always performed by immersion*, is impossible.

Moreover, it may be observed here, that all religious ordinances of Divine appointment, are addressed to the understanding, to the heart and to the conscience ; never to the imagination or to the fancy. It is a well known fact that immersion so operates on the imagination or fancy of the careless and prayerless part of a community, that they will, at almost any time, leave their other amusements to see a person immersed. Immersion therefore, since it is addressed to the imagination or fancy, cannot be one of those Di-

*See Heb. 9: 10 in Greek.

vine ordinances which are not addressed to either of these mental powers.

Thus it is manifest that the word baptize is often used where it is impossible for it to denote immerse. It is therefore absolutely impossible for a true believer in Divine revelation, after he has carfully examined this subject, to believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

CHAPTER VIII.

ASSERTIONS AND QUESTIONS.

1. *Assertions cannot prove immersion to be baptism, or the only mode of baptism.* If they could, proof in abundance on this subject would thus be furnished. That immersion is the only mode of baptism, is often asserted with as much assurance, as if the declaration was, not only made, but frequently made, in the word of God. When the inquirer after truth, takes the liberty of reading the scriptures for himself, and does not find the word immerse used so much as once for any purpose whatever, in the whole of Divine revelation; nor yet find it intimated in a single passage, that any person was put under water for baptism; he feels as if attempts had been made to impose on his common sense. The assertions most frequently made by immersers on this subject, may here be noticed. (1.) *They often assert*, that the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize always signifies immerse. But God in his word does not tell us that it always or ever has such a signification (*a*); so that on this point, we have merely their assertion instead of proof. This does not pass current with all persons as a substitute for Divine revelation. (2.) *They often assert*, that immersion is the principal meaning of the original word for baptize. But the word of God does not say this. It is mere assertion without proof. If however this were its principal signification; no evidence would thereby be furnished to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. If this assertion were true, (but it is not,) it would simply prove that immersion is one mode of baptism; not that it is the only mode. (3.) *It is often asserted*, that immersion is the original mean-

(*a*) See Ch. 1, § 7.

ing of the word baptize. By this expression, they seem to intimate that the Greek word for baptize originally denoted immerse and nothing else. But here again we have nothing but a bold assertion, totally destitute of truth. Besides, the word of God makes no such statement. (4.) *It is often asserted*, that the root (βαπτω) from which the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize is derived, always signifies immerse. But in the scriptures no such declaration is made. Moreover, the assertion itself is entirely destitute of truth. All these and similar statements are mere assertions without the least semblance of proof from the word of God. They are in fact only false assertions. (5.) *It is stated*, that Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water ; but it is not said that they went down under the water (*a*). When persons are immersed, they do more than go into, they also go or are put under the water. To go into the water is not to be immersed. Many persons go into the water who do not go under its surface. (6.) *It is asserted*, to prove immersion, that the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as Philip and the Eunuch, "came up out of the water;" but to *come out* of the water is not to come *from under* it (*b*). Many persons have come out of the water who had never been immersed, or been under its surface. Those who have been immersed come from under, not merely out of the water. Those who have been *in* or *into* the water one inch or six, *come out* of it. Those who have been immersed, come from under it, or from below its surface. (7.) *It is asserted*, that pious men believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism. But pious men's belief is not Divine revelation. Besides, ten, twenty, fifty, a hundred or more pious men believe that immersion is not the only mode of baptism, where one believes that it is. (8.) *It is asserted*, that learned men say that the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, always denotes immerse. But these men are not God. The scriptures contain no such declaration. Besides, when a man makes such an assertion as this, either his learning on this subject, or his veracity will be questioned by every person who understands the original scriptures and has carefully examined that word. (9.) *It is often stated* that, if immersion is not baptism or the only mode of baptism ; then this ordinance is

(*a*) See Ch. 3, § 2. (*b*) See Ch. 3, § 3.

not mentioned in the word of God. It does not follow however, that if immersion is not found in God's word, then nothing else is found there. Baptize or sprinkle may be found recorded in Divine revelation, though immersion is not. But if nothing was said in the scriptures concerning sprinkling or baptism in any mode; this silence would not prove immersion to be the only mode of baptism. (10. *It is frequently asserted* that there is as much evidence in favor of immersion, as there is in favor of any mode of baptism. If this were the case, it would not prove immersion to be the only mode of baptism. It would simply prove that it is one mode. But if, in God's word, there is no more evidence for baptism, than there is for immersion; then there is none for either; because it has already been shown, that, in the whole scriptures, there is no precept *for* immersion, no example *of* immersion, no inferential evidence *in favor of* immersion, nor even an allusion made *to* immersion (*a*). But if "tekel"* (*b*) must be written on immersion by him who takes the word of God and that only for evidence in religious duties; it by no means follows that baptism, in another mode, is equally unsupported by Divine revelation.

Moreover, it may be remarked that the assertion so often made, that there is as much evidence, in the word of God, to sustain immersion as there is in favor of sprinkling, is not really the position which immersers are to prove. Their position is that immersion is *the only mode* of baptism. But if there is as much evidence in favor of sprinkling as there is for immersion, then sprinkling, according to this their own admission, must be a mode of baptism, sustained by as good evidence as immersion is. If this is true, then immersion cannot be the only mode of baptism; and the assertion that it is such cannot be true. When he who asserts that immersion is the only mode of baptism, does not even attempt to present scriptural evidence to sustain his position, but affirms that there is as much evidence for immersion as there is for sprinkling; he shows, by employing such sophistry, that he is himself satisfied that God's word does not sus-

(*a*) See Ch. 1, § 1–8, Ch. 2, § 1–4, Ch. 3, § 1–10, Ch. 4, § 1–5. *Dan. 5: 25. 27.
(*b*) "Tekel" is a Chaldee word. It signifies, he is weighed. It also includes the idea of deficiency in what is weighed.

tain his exclusive position. Besides, if it was expressly declared in the scriptures, that sprinkling is not a mode of baptism, even such a declaration would not prove that immersion is the only or even one mode of administering this ordinance. If it was made, (but it is not,) it would simply prove that sprinkling is not baptism. But such a declaration would, by no means, prove that immersion is what it pretends to be, the only mode of baptism. It is often imagined that the preceding and similar assertions prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. When men substitute assertions for proof, it is no wonder that they mistake falsehood for truth.

2. *Questions do not prove that immersion is baptism or the only mode of baptism.* They only show the amount of knowledge which the individual to whom they are proposed may possess or may wish to communicate on the subject to which they relate. The fact that an individual does not answer a question proposed to him, merely proves that he either cannot or will not do so. It does not prove that the question asked cannot be answered by others. It does not even prove that the question is a difficult one. If a person should assert that the President of the United States received a salary of one hundred thousand dollars a year, he ought to prove the position he maintained by making such an assertion. But if when proof is demanded, the asserter in his wisdom enquires ; if he does not receive this sum annually, why does he commission so many naval officers ? every person could perceive that this question could not prove his assertion to be true. It would be perfectly manifest that, whether this question was answered correctly or incorrectly, or not at all, the answer could not prove that the President received an annual salary of a hundred thousand or of twenty-five thousand dollars (*a*). It could not even prove that he received any salary. The answer to any one question or more can only prove the amount of knowledge possessed by the individual questioned. But to prove that any one person or more possesses a large or a small amount of knowledge on the subject of baptism, or on any other subject, cannot prove that immersion is or is not baptism or the only mode of baptism. To prove the exclusive claims of immersion, some-

(a) He receives twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

thing more than asking questions, is necessary. Indeed, this plan of asking questions, instead of presenting positive proof, is a plan often resorted to by designing men to sustain, in appearance, a cause which they perceive, has, in reality, no support. They suppose the person cannot answer the question proposed to him. If they are right in this their supposition, they endeavor to leave the impression on his mind, that the proof of the position is therefore complete. If the first question they propose is answered correctly, they ask another, and thus continue on, till the person they are questioning discovers their intrigue or fails to answer. But it ought always to be remembered that asking or answering questions never proves any thing, but the amount of knowledge possessed by him who answers them and the intrigue of such as propose them. On this point, they make an appeal to the real or supposed ignorance of the persons they question ; and then endeavor by that ignorance, if it exists, to sustain their position, instead of doing so by fair argument or positive proof.

When immersers begin to see how utterly unfounded their exclusive claims are ; and how completely destitute they are of scriptural evidence to support their much-loved system of immersion as the only, or even as a mode of baptism expressly taught in Divine revelation, they then resort to questions. They enquire ; why did John baptize "in Jordan," or "in Enon" if he did not immerse ? Why did Philip and the Eunuch go down into the water, if the latter was not immersed ? Why did Christ, as well as Philip and the Eunuch, "come up out of the water," if they were not immersed ? Now these questions, whether they are or are not answered correctly, cannot prove that immersion is or is not, a mode, or the only mode of baptism. To answer or not to answer these, and a thousand similar questions, would really prove nothing either for or against immersion. If, when these questions were asked, the person to whom they were proposed, should say that he could not answer them ; certainly his ignorance on this part of the subject of baptism, would not prove that immersion is the only mode of administering that ordinance. If he should attempt to answer them and fail to do so correctly, his failure could not possi-

bly prove that immersion is baptism or the only mode of baptism. But if he answered them correctly, his knowledge on this point, would be as far from sustaining the exclusive claims of immersion, as his ignorance. Whether therefore the questions were answered correctly, or incorrectly, or not at all, there could be no evidence furnished by the answers to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. All that the answers could possibly prove, would be the amount of knowledge which the person who gave them, could and would communicate on this particular subject.

These questions are not answered in the word of God. The answers to them cannot therefore be a matter of importance in a religious point of view. They cannot be even a part of the religion of the christian; for this plain reason; they are not recorded in the scriptures. What is not revealed in God's book, is not, and cannot be made by man, a portion of the religion of christians. It is however, no difficult matter to find answers to these questions. But it ought to be remembered, that whether they are answered right or wrong, or not at all, no proof can be furnished by the answers in favor of immersion being the only mode of baptism. John baptized *in* or *at* the Jordan, "with" its waters,* in order that "the multitude," who came to his baptism, might have water with which to refresh themselves and their beasts. He baptized "in Enon," not because the water was sufficiently deep to immerse persons in, but because there was "much" of it "there." The word "much" does not express depth, but number. This is one meaning of the word in English and deep is not. The original word (πολλα) for much, very frequently expresses number and never depth. It literally signifies, and is usually translated "many." This word "many," generally, if not universally, indicates number. When "the Lord" said of Athens; "I have much people in this city," the word "much" certainly expresses number. In this and the other passage, the same Greek word is used.† In one passage it is used in the singular, and in the other it is in the plural number. The fact that "in Enon" water boils up out of the ground in a number of places (*a*), and a small rivulet runs from each, so as to unite in

*Mat. 3: 6. 11, Mark 1: 8. 9, Luke 3: 7. 16. †John 3: 23, Acts 18: 9. 10 in Greek and English. (*a*) See Sacred Geography.

a little reservoir a few inches deep, from which a very small brook flows, is another evidence that the word "much" is expressive of number, not of depth. From these small springs, man and beast might easily be refreshed with drink. But in not one of them, could an adult be immersed, unless the water was raised by some artificial means; and there is not the least hint that any thing of this kind was done or attempted. John baptized at Enon then, not because there was deep water there to immerse adults in; but because there were (υδατα πολλα) many waters or several small springs there, from which those who came to be baptized, might easily obtain water to drink. It may be farther observed that there is no intimation in this passage that this "much water" was necessary for, or that it was used in, baptism. Besides, one person at one and the same time, could not use (υδατα πολλα) many streams or places of water in administering baptism in any mode whatever. Philip and the Eunuch went down *to*, *towards* or *into* (*a*) the water for the sake of convenience. They stepped out of the chariot, and down *to* or perhaps a few inches "*into*" the water, that Philip might readily obtain so much of the element that with it he might baptize the Eunuch. They came *from* the water, or if they went a few inches into it, then they came out of it (*b*), *not from under its surface*, that they might return to the chariot. Jesus Christ came *from* the water, or if he had stepped a few inches into the edge of the Jordan, he came *out of*, *not from under* its waters (*c*), that he might retire into "the wilderness"* and then "finish" the remainder of his "work" on earth.† Thus these questions which are so often proposed, are answered. But whether they are answered right or wrong, is a matter equally indifferent so far as immersion is concerned. If the answers are correct, immersion is not thereby proved to be the only mode of baptism; nor is that point proved, if each answer is totally incorrect. The answers prove neither more nor less than that the author of them has and chooses to communicate, a certain amount of knowledge on these particular parts of the subject of baptism. From these remarks it is manifestly an undeniable fact, that questions, however answered, or if not

(*a*) See Ch. 3, § 4. (*b*) See Ch. 3, § 5. (*c*) See Ch. 3, § 7. *Mat. 4: 1, Mark 1: 10. 12. 13. †John 17: 4.

answered at all, cannot prove immersion to be baptism, or the only mode of baptism.

PART SECOND.

HUMAN AUTHORITY RELATING TO IMMERSION.

CHAPTER I.

LEXICONS AND DICTIONARIES ON IMMERSION.

1. *Greek Lexicons (a) do not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* Whatever these teach, it should be remembered, is only human wisdom. The instruction which they contain, is, in fact, no authority in a Divine ordinance. Whether therefore they do or do not teach that immersion is a mode or the only mode of baptism, is not material. The word of God and that only can decide with authority as to the mode of baptism. Each of the principal Greek Lexicographers (*b*) teaches that the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize has a great variety of meanings. Seven of the principal authors (*c*) who have made it their business to explain the meaning of Greek words, give together, more than forty different significations to the Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize. The whole of them present the following as the true signification of the original word in the various connections in which it is used by different writers. It denotes, they say, to purify, wash, sprinkle, dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, depress, humble, overwhelm, bathe, paint, be dejected, cleanse, baptize, saturate, perform ablution, imbue largely, cleanse ceremonially, soak thoroughly, receive baptism, be baptized, bestow liberally, confound totally, drench with wine, be immersed, overwhelm with any thing, administer the rite of baptism, procure one's own baptism, receive the gifts or miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost, be immersed in a sea or flood of afflictions, endanger one's life, to

(*a*) Lexicon is the name usually given to a book which explains the meaning of words in the Greek and Hebrew languages.

It is worthy of observation here that a few years ago, immersers were accustomed to admit that the Lexicons were against their exclusive notions ; (See Dr. Miller on Baptism.) Now, and for the last eight or ten years, they assert that all, or all the principal Lexicons sustain their system ; (See Bliss on Baptism.) That they were formerly right in relation to the Lexicons will be manifest to those who examine this subject. (*b*) Writers of Lexicons. (*c*) See the Greek Lexicons written by Grove, Pickering, Greenfield, Schleusner, Donnegan, Schrevelius, and Parkhurst.

die, bind to the performance of some duty, impose obligation by baptism, receive the rite of baptism, be baptized to any one, bind one's self to honor, obey and follow any one, be initiated by the rite of baptism, be prodigal towards one, be immersed *in* or overwhelmed *with* miseries, oppressed with calamities, wash with water in token of purification from sin or spiritual pollution, immerse repeatedly into a liquid, voluntary reception of baptism, and dip in a vessel and draw. Several of these meanings, it will be seen, are nearly synonymous. They are all that are given by seven of the principal Greek Lexicographers. Nor is it known that any other Greek Lexicon will add any thing of importance to these significations. Certain it is, that no other Lexicon will add any thing more to what these say on the subject of immersion. The original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize has however a number of other meanings (*a*), though the Lexicons do not mention any more. These Greek Lexicographers, it is manifest, do not teach that immersion is the only signification of the original word for baptize; neither do they intimate that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Four of them (*b*) clearly teach that in the New Testament, the original word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, does not signify immerse; and these alone of the seven distinguish between its meanings in the New Testament and in other books. Two of them (*c*) explain the original by Latin words. To define the Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, they use the Latin words (*baptizo*) for baptize, (*mergo*) for dip, (*abluo*) for wash, and (*lavo*) for lave, sprinkle or draw out. All these Latin words are used in common by both these writers to express the meaning of the Greek word for baptize. One of them (*d*) gives no other meaning to the word. He does not therefore use (*immersio*, *immersus* or *immergo*,) a word which evidently denotes immerse as even one of the meanings of that (βαπτιζω) for baptize. The other (*e*) adds the word (*immergo*) the word for immerse, (*intingo*) that for dip in, and (*purgo*) that for purge. These seven Lexicons are therefore very far from supporting the exclusive claims of immersion. Four out of the seven definitely teach that the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize does not, in the

(a) See Ch 2, § 4. *(b)* Parkhurst, Pickering, Greenfield and Schleusner. *(c)* Schleusner and Schrevelius. *(d)* Schrevelius. *(e)* Schleusner.

New Testament, signify immerse. One of these four does not give this even as a definite meaning of this term (βαπτιζω;) the other three do not say whether it does or does not, in the original scriptures, signify immerse; and not one of them so much as intimates, that this is the only, or even the principal meaning of (βαπτιζω,) the original word for baptize. These authors therefore furnish no evidence to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Besides, from the meanings which these principal Greek Lexicographers give to the original word for baptize, it is evident that its general signification is fourfold. According to them, it denotes, (1.) The application of water; as when it is used to signify *wash*, *sprinkle*, &c. (2.) It is used when water may or may not be used; as when it denotes to cleanse, saturate, overwhelm, &c. (3.) It is used when the idea of water applied in any way, is not included in its meaning; as when it denotes to paint, depress, humble, bestow liberally, and the like. (4.) It denotes to drink largely; as when it implies to drench or physic with wine. These are the significations which the best Greek scholars give of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, instead of saying that it always denotes immerse or the submersion of what is baptized entirely under water.

These same writers inform us that the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize is derived from another (βαπτω) which signifies, to dip, dip in, sprinkle, tinge, sink, wash, wet, moisten, bathe, steep, imbue, dye, stain, color, plunge, immerse, submerge, draw out water by dipping a vessel into it, fill by drawing out of one vessel into another, temper metals by immersing them in water, draw up, fill by drawing up, and to be lost as a ship. This word, it appears, does not always signify immersion, any more than the original one (βαπτιζω) for baptize. Like its derivative (βαπτιζω) it has a large number of meanings. It is used (1.) Where water is applied; as when it denotes to wash, wet, sprinkle, and the like. (2.) It is used when water is not applied; as when it denotes to color, dye, stain, &c. (3.) It expresses destruction whether by water or otherwise; as a ship may be lost or wrecked on a rock as well as be foundered at sea. It is undeniably certain, from the various meanings of the word (βαπτιζω)

for baptize, and also from those of (βαπτω) the root from which it is derived, that immersion is far, very far, from being the only signification of the word baptize, as given in the Greek Lexicons. It is moreover, from the same evidence, equally manifest that immersion cannot be the only mode of baptism.

2. *Latin Dictionaries do not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* The principal writers of Latin Dictionaries(*a*) inform us that the word (*baptizo*) used in that language for baptize, denotes to baptize any one, to wash in a baptismal font(*b*), to sprinkle, to initiate into the christian religion, and to initiate a person into a christian assembly. But they do not represent immerse as being even one meaning of the Latin word for baptize ; and much less do they intimate that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

3. *French and German Dictionaries do not sustain the exclusive claims of immersion.* The French Dictionaries(*c*) explain baptize to mean, to christen, to administer the sacrament of baptism; and the German explain it by a word (*taufen,*) which signifies to christen, to baptize. These Dictionaries do not even intimate that immersion is ever one of the significations of the word baptize(*d*). They cannot therefore be said in truth to inculcate the sentiment that immersion is a mode, or the only mode of baptism.

4. *Other Gothic languages do not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* In the Dutch language, a word (*doopen*) is used for baptize, which denotes to sprinkle, dip, pour or baptize. It is used in connection with a preposition which signifies *with*, not *in* or *under*. The Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize when translated into the Dutch language is used in a variety of senses, besides those here mentioned. But to immerse, or to go or be put entirely under water is not definitely mentioned as one of its meanings. It denotes to apply water to the person baptized ; not to apply the person to the water. To sprinkle is mentioned as one of its definite significations. The Dutch do not use their word (*doopen*) for baptize which signifies to sprinkle, to de-

(*a*)See Ainsworth's, Leverett's, &c., Dictionaries. (*b*)This is a stone vessel which contains the water for baptism. It is found in many Episcopal Churches. It contains but a few quarts. It is used for sprinkling or ponring, not for immersion. (*c*)See Boyer's, Nugent's, Meadow's &c., Dict. (*d*)See Turner's, Hurst's, Fosdick's, &c,. Dictionaries.

note immerse. In their language a different word is employed for this purpose. It is therefore certain that (*doopen*) the Dutch word for baptize signifies to sprinkle ; and it is by no means certain that it ever denotes immerse. It is manifest therefore that the word (*doopen*) used in the Dutch language for baptize, does not sustain the notion that immersion is the only, or even a mode of baptism(*a*). The other Gothic languages give no more countenance to the exclusives than the German and Dutch. In the Meso-gothic language or dialect the word (*daupian*) for baptize, denotes to sprinkle, to apply water to a person in baptism. The Saxon word (*dyppan*) for baptize, also the Swedish (*dopa*) and the Danish (*dobe*) for baptize, all have the same signification(*b*). Each of these words for baptize denotes to sprinkle, to apply water to a person in baptism. In these languages these words are used in no other sense; nor are they used for any other purpose. Another word is used in each of them for immerse. The preposition with which each of them is connected excludes the possibility of immersion being the meaning of any one of the words used in these languages for baptize. This preposition is the word for *with.* These people all speak of baptizing *with* water, none of them of baptizing in or under water. Besides, they all baptize by sprinkling or pouring ; none of them by immersion. Even the Mennonite Baptists of Holland have baptized by pouring for more than a hundred years(*c*). These people certainly understand the meaning of the words in their own languages as well as immersers in England or America do. These Gothic languages therefore do not teach that immersion is even one mode, much less that it is the only mode of baptism(*b*).

5. *English Dictionaries do not inform us that the word baptize always denotes immerse.* The principal of these (*d*) inform us that the word baptize signifies to christen, to administer the sacrament of baptism. By one of them(*e*) to plunge, to apply water as a sign of admission into the church, are added as other meanings of the word. The term bap-

(*a*) See Rev. W. Brakel's works Rott. Ed. 17. v. i, p. 952 as quoted by Rev. J. B. Ten Eyck, of Berea, N. Y., Dr. Henderson. (*b*) Dr. Henderson; Ch. In. No. 550. (*c*) Miller. (*d*) See Johnson's, Walker's, and Webster's Dictionaries. (*e*) See Webster's duodecimo Dictionary printed in 1806.

tism, they say denotes; (1.) The application of water to a person as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible church of Christ; (2.) The sufferings of Christ. (3.) So much of the gospel as was preached by John the Baptist. In one of these Dictionaries(*a*) baptism is mentioned as a washing or sprinkling with water; a holy ordinance and sign of admission into Christ's church. A noted one(*b*) teaches that *baptize* means to wash, to sprinkle, to dip, to immerse. English Dictionaries do not therefore teach that baptize always signifies immerse, or that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

6. *Writers of Concordances(c) do not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* In these are frequently collected the various meanings of important words found in the scriptures. The principal one of these(*d*) says that baptism is, (1.) An outward ordinance or sacrament wherein, the washing with water, represents the cleansing of the soul from sin by the blood of Christ, 1 Pet. 3: 21; (2.) An inward, spiritual washing whereby the gifts and graces of the Spirit, signified by the outward sign, are really and actually bestowed, Mat. 3: 11; (3.) The sufferings of Christ, whereby he was consecrated and prepared for his entrance upon his kingly office, Mat. 20: 22, Luke 12: 50; (4.) So much of the gospel as John the Baptist taught his disciples when he baptized them, Acts 18: 25. In all this, immersion is not so much as mentioned as one mode of baptism. It is not once even named as a meaning of the word baptize. It is certain therefore that immersion is not here represented as being the only or even as being one mode of baptism.

7. *Hebrew Lexicons do not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* The word baptize is not found in the Hebrew language. The word (טבל) translated into Greek by (Βαπτω) the root from which (Βαπτιζω) that for baptize is derived, and once by (Βαπτιζω) the one for baptize itself,* signifies to dip in a small part, to wet, dye, sprinkle, wash, plunge in the ditch, &c(*e*). But it does not, in the Hebrew Bible, signify to put the body entirely under water. In one

(*a*)See Webster's duodecimo Dictionary printed in 1806. (*b*)Calmet. (*d*)A concordance is a book in which the leading words of the Bible are so arranged that different passages of scripture can easily be found. (*d*)Cruden's. *See 2 Kings 5: 14 in English and Hebrew, and called, 4 Kings in Greek. (*e*)See Simon's and Eichorn's Heb. Lex. See also Cocceius.

Lexicon(a) it is defined by the words "dip in" and "immerse," but not by language which necessarily carries the idea of being entirely covered with water. Hebrew Lexicons do not therefore teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

Of more than twenty of the principal Dictionaries and Lexicons in eleven different languages, not one sustains the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Not one half of them mention immerse as one of the meanings of the word baptize; nor do those among them which give this as one of its meanings, intimate that they use it to express the action of putting a person under water and then immediately taking him out again. Not one of them teaches that when he gives immerse as a meaning of the word baptize; he intends by it to express the idea of putting a person under the surface of water. And this is by no means the necessary or only meaning of the word immerse(b). Not one of them gives the least intimation that this word (Βαπτιζω) expresses the two parts which are essential to immersion, and which are invariably performed when a person is immersed. These are (1.) Putting that part of the person not already wet, entirely under water; and (2.) Taking him up again. Both these are always performed in the ceremony of immersion. No one can therefore say with truth, that immersion is, in the Lexicons and Dictionaries, represented as being the only mode of baptism. It is not even certain, from what they say, that they intend to teach that the word baptize ever denotes any part of what is done in immersion. It is true, that some few of them, say that one of its meanings is immerse; but these do not inform us that they then or always use this word to denote the putting of a person under water. Had they done this; they would have definitely shown what they supposed the word does mean, when they give immerse as one of its significations. But the writers of Dictionaries, whatever idea may be attached to the word immerse, when, it is, in some few instances, used by them as one meaning of the word baptize, do not sustain the exclusive claims of immersers. They do not altogether, nor does any one of them, teach that the word baptize always or necessarily signifies immerse. They do not teach that

(a)Gibbs'. (b)Ch. 3, § 4. (c)See B. i, P vii, Ch. 1, § 4.

this is its original or primitive meaning. Nor do they intimate that immersion is the only mode of baptism. For this, many immersers and all the exclusives contend. This, in fact, is the point disputed. But it would be much more easy to prove that immersion is *not a mode*, than that it is the *only mode*, of baptism. More than one half of the principal Dictionaries and Lexicons, in eleven different languages, teach that immersion is not baptism, by not giving that as one of its meanings; while not one of them teach or intimate that this is its only meaning, or that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Some of the best of them teach that immersion is not baptism, or that the word baptize does not signify immerse; but none of them intimate that it is the only or even the principal meaning of the word baptize; or that immersion is the only mode of baptism. The exclusive claims of immersers cannot therefore be sustained by the Lexicons and Dictionaries.

CHAPTER II.

WRITERS RELATING TO IMMERSION.

1. *Where the word baptize is used in the Apocrypha, it does not teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* Judith, it is said, "washed herself in a fountain," (εβαπτισζετο—επι της πηγης του υσατος) literally she baptized herself at, over or on the spring or well of water(*a*). The same preposition (επι) which is used here, is used where it is said of Christ, "he sat"—(επι) "on the well;" and also in the expression, "he shall reign" (επι) "over the house of Jacob."* In that country springs or wells did not usually contain a sufficient quantity of water to immerse adults in(*b*). Moreover the Greek word (επι) does not denote *under* nor convey the idea of immersion. A participle (βαπτιζομενος) from the same word is used to indicate the ceremonial washing of a person who had touched a dead body(*c*). The mode of performing this purification was not by immersion. It was always by sprinkling.† In the Apocrypha therefore immersers can find no support for their exclusive system; no proof

(*a*)See Judith 12: 7 in Greek and English. *John 4: 6. Luke 1: 33 in Greek. (*b*)See Sacred Geography. (*c*)See Ecclesiasticus 34: 25 in English or 31: 30 in Greek, in which language the book is called The Wisdom of Sirach. †See Num. 19: 11. 18–20.

that immersion is the only mode of baptism or the only meaning of the Greek word for baptism.

2. *Greek writers do not countenance the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* Many early christians wrote in Greek. Some Jews also wrote in that language. These, as well as the heathen natives of Greece, have left many works written in Greek. A considerable number of these remain to the present day. In some of these works, the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize frequently occurs, and in others it is more rarely found. But so far are these writers from using that word uniformly to denote immerse; that they very seldom, if ever, use it in such a connection as necessarily requires it to have that signification. The word (βαπτιζω) for baptize does not in Greek writers, in one instance in a thousand, if at all, necessarily signify to put entirely under water. Nor has it been found, in a single passage in any Greek author, to have the least allusion to the two-fold action performed in immersion; that of putting the body entirely under water and immediately taking it up again. These writers do not therefore teach or intimate that immersion is the only or even a mode of baptism. Besides, this word (βαπτιζω) is often used in the works of the best Greek writers in such connection as to render immersion as its meaning impossible. Moreover, no one of them uses, as a substitute for baptize or to point out its signification, either of the words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) which frequently denote one part of what is done when persons are immersed. It may also be remarked that no one of these writers uses, for this purpose, even the word (δυπτω) for dip or that (δυνω) which signifies to go or move into or under any place or thing. These men do not therefore give us the most distant hint by which we can infer that the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize always denotes immerse; or that this is even one of its definite significations. The most that can be fairly inferred from their language is that this word may sometimes or may possibly, in some expressions used by them, denote a very small part of what is done by immersers as a substitute for baptism. But even in those passages in which this word is so used that it may possibly denote that what is mentioned was entirely covered with water;

still the connection by no means renders this meaning necessary. The sense will not be injured by giving the word a different signification. It ought also to be remembered that these Greek writers who thus use the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, were either natives of Greece and spoke its language as their mother tongue; or they understood it as well as if they had been born and educated in that land of song and of science. These masters of the Greek language(*a*), do not show by their writings, that the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize at any time certainly signifies to put entirely under water; but they do show that it cannot always denote any one thing that immerse ever signifies. They frequently use it where immerse cannot be its meaning(*b*).

3. *Pedobaptist(c) writers do not hold or teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* Immersers frequently assert this; but to sustain this assertion they have not the least shadow of evidence whatever. They sometimes affirm that Henry, Doddridge, Scott, and others, teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism. But no one of these, or indeed any other Pedobaptist writer of any note, and probably not one of any kind, does now, or ever has taught that immersion, and that only, is baptism. Immersers have so altered Henry's exposition of the Bible, as to make it say many things which its own author did not say, or teach, or believe. But by all these alterations, they can scarcely make that old saint's writings help to build up their exclusive system. Indeed, they have not yet named a single Pedobaptist writer, good or bad, wise or unwise, who has sustained their exclusive notions. Those they have named are

(*a*) See Dyonysius, Basil, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus (Bks. 1 and 16) Josephus, Homer (Odys. 9,) Euripides (Hecuba Art. iii.) Theocritus (Idyl. v.) Strabo (Bks. 13 and 16,) Dion Cassius (Bk 37,) Heliodorus (Ethiopia Bk. i,) Eschylus, Eusebius, &c.

(*b*) In Homer's (βατραχομυομαχια) battle of the frogs and mice, it is said, when the frog Cambophagus was killed; "the lake" (εβαπτετο) "was baptized with the purple blood of the frog." This battle was on the verge of a small lake. In the contest a frog is said to have been killed. His death occurred either in the edge of the water; or his body must, while bleeding fresh, have entered the lake. This lake was some miles in circumference; and the elegant Greek poet, Homer, says, the lake was baptized with the blood of this frog. Only a very small portion of the water in this lake was tinged or stained with or had the blood of this frog-warrior applied to its surface. The whole lake could not have been immersed in or put entirely under the blood of one frog. Even an immerser, however ignorant or prejudiced he might be, would hardly say that the word baptize here means immerse. But if it always means immerse, as immersers confidently assert, then this lake (poor thing!!) must have been put entirely under the blood of his frogship.

(*c*) Pedobaptist is one who believes in the baptism of infants.

very far from sustaining their position. Besides, with all their boasting on this point; it is believed that they cannot name one Pedobaptist writer who now does, or ever has, maintained the opinion, that immersion is the only mode of baptism. While several of them admit, that baptism may be administered by immersion as well as by sprinkling; it is not known that any among them denies the validity of the ordinance when administered in this last named mode. Moreover, it is not known that an individual among them teaches in his writings or in words that immersion and that only is baptism; or that immersion is essential to the ordinance of christian baptism. To assert therefore that Pedobaptist writers sustain the doctrine that immersion is the only mode of baptism, is a crime which will not here be named. Immersers cannot, on this point, even appeal to the Greek church for support; for, though that church, among its other deviations from the word of God, generally practice the immersion of their infant children; yet there is no evidence that they maintain the exclusive notion that nothing but immersion is baptism; but there is positive evidence to the contrary.

4. *In Greek writers the word for baptize, its root, and their compounds, have a variety of meanings not usually mentioned by Lexicographers.* Some of these may be noticed here. The various significations given in the Lexicons to the Greek word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, and to (Βαπτω) the one from which it is derived, have already been mentioned (*a*). Some others, from Greek authors, will here be presented. The reader, especially if he has an accurate knowledge of the Greek language, will readily perceive the propriety of these significations, from the connections in which the words are found. The principal meanings of these words which are not mentioned in the Greek Lexicons, are (1.) *To wet a very small part.* It is said of the priest when preparing to cleanse the leper; "he shall take" the living bird, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them—in the blood of the bird that was killed."* It is evident from this and other passages of scripture,† that the

(*a*) See Ch. 1, §1. *Lev. 14: 6, 51 in Greek. †See Ex. 12: 22. Lev. 4: 6, 17 and 9: 9 and 14: 16, Num. 19: 18, Deut. 33: 24, 1 Sam. (called in Greek 1 Kings,) 14: 27, in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and Luke 16: 24 in Greek.

Greek word (Βαπτω) translated dip, signifies to wet a very small part of what is dipped. (2.) *To extend to, toward or near to;* as in the passage "he that" (εμβαψας) "dippeth his hand with me in the dish—shall betray me."* As it would be inconsistent with common propriety for each of two persons to immerse or put a hand entirely under the food in a dish out of which they and others were eating, or even to put any part of their hands into the food; so the meaning of the word here translated dip, must be to *extend to, towards* or *near to* the dish out of which they were receiving food. (3.) *To touch;* as in the passage "the feet of the priests"—(εβαφησαν) "were dipped in the brim of the water" of the Jordan.† Their feet were not in the water but in the brim of it, or at its very edge; that is, their feet merely touched the water. (4.) *To put in the edge.* An elegant Greek writer says; "a smith to harden an iron hatchet" (Βαπτει) "dips it in cold water (*a*); that is, he dips the edge, not the whole tool into the water. (5.) *To stab,* pierce or run through. It is said, "the child" (Βαψει) "shall run his sword into the viper's bowels" (*b*). So small a reptile as a viper may be stabbed or pierced with the point of a sword; but it would be impossible to cover a sword entirely in its body. (6.) *To transfer* from one pot to another in any way. A master says, "my servant" (Βαψει) "shall dip me a cup of honey" (*c*); that is, he shall transfer the honey from the vessel which contains it, to a cup to be carried to the master. (7.) *To swim* as a bladder. It is declared, "the bladder" (Βαπτιζη) "can swim, but to sink is not the law" of its nature (*d*). It may swim, but cannot sink, of itself. (8.) *To be embarrassed* with debt. The same writer says of a certain character (*e*), he (Βεβαπτισμενος) "is embarrassed with debt to the amount of fifty millions of drachms" (*f*). He who is thus deeply in debt must be embarrassed with it; but it does not entirely cover his body or put it under water. (9.) To be up to the middle (*g*); (10.) up to the breast (*h*); (11.) up to the head

*Mat. 26: 23. †Josh. 3: 15 in the Greek Bible. (*a*) Homer, (Odys. 9.) (*b*) Lycophon in Cassandra, ver. 1121. (*c*) Theocrytus Idyl. 5. ver. 126. (*d*) Plutrarch; the original is ασκος βαπτιζη, δυναι δε τοι ουθεμις εστι. (*e*) Plutrarch of Otho. (*f*) A dram, drachm, or daric, was a Persian coin of gold. It was worth about five dollars and a half. His debt therefore was about 275 millions of dollars. He must have been a believer in the credit system. (*g*) Strabo. (*h*) Polybius.

(*not over it*) in water (*a*). (12.) *To sweep away* as an overflowing stream (*b*). (13.) *To lay on* as taxes. (14.) *To overflow* as water does when the tide rises (*c*). When this takes place water comes upon, or overflows the land. In this case, the whole land is not covered, nor even every part of the beach, with the water of the rising tide. Nor is that part of the land which is then covered, plunged into or put entirely under water or immersed; but the water comes upon the land. (15.) *To be drunk* (*d*). (16.) *To adhere to* (*c*). (17.) *To improve* the mind (*e*). (18.) *To terrify.** (19.) *To stain.* A Latin writer (*f*) says, "what the Greeks express by" (Βαπτισμος) "baptize, we," Romans, "express by to stain." (20.) *To habituate.* A Greek philosopher (*c*) says of a young man; "the youth" (εβαπτισατο) "habituated himself to sophistry." (21.) *To ruin* as a city is, when it is destroyed (*g*). (22.) *To suffer*, as is intimated in the declaration of our Saviour when he says; "I have a" (Βαπτισμα) "baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished."† The sufferings of Christ were mainly in the garden of Gethsemane and on the cross. None of them were by immersion. This baptism then of which he here speaks, could not possibly have been by putting his body entirely under water. To the significations of the words under consideration, many others might be added, besides those here mentioned. Not one of these, it will be observed, is immerse. Indeed, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to find the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, or its root (Βαπτω,) so used as necessarily to denote the entire submersion under water of what is said to have been baptized. When one of these words describes a ship as sinking or sunk in a river or even in the ocean, it by no means follows, that every part of the vessel is entirely under water. Indeed, portions of a sunk or wrecked ship, are generally above or floating on the surface of the water. When either of them denotes to drown, it is manifest to all, that this effect may be produced by the head or even the face of the person drowned being in the water. After examining only a considerable number of the meanings of the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, who, in his sober senses, can believe that it always signifies immerse?

(*a*) Porphyry. (*b*) Diodorus. (*c*) Plato. (*d*) Aristotle. (*e*) Marcus Antoninus. *Isa. 21: 4 in Greek. (*f*) Xylander. (*g*) Josephus. †Luke 12: 50 in Greek.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS RELATING TO IMMERSION.

1. *The Greek Church does not sustain the exclusive system of modern immersers.* This Church extends over nearly twenty countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Its members, at least thirty millions in number, speak more than forty different languages and dialects. The religion of this Church consists of a multiplicity of ridiculous ceremonies. Its members and preachers are generally ignorant, bigoted and superstitious. It is called the Greek or Eastern Church, not because its members speak or understand the Greek language ; because very few of them do either ; but in opposition to the Latin or Western Church. For baptism they usually immerse each of their infant children three times. The example of the Greek Church cannot therefore favor the practice of those who refuse to baptize infants and who immerse only once for baptism. Besides, there is no evidence that the Greek Church maintains that her immersion or any other, is the only mode of baptism. Indeed, there is positive evidence to the contrary. Some parts of this Church baptize occasionally, if not frequently, by sprinkling (*a*). Of those who do so, several classes might be mentioned (*b*). They also "frequently," but not always, "re-baptize the Latins who embrace their communion (*c*). Moreover, it is said (*d*), that the Greek Church practices effusion after immersion. This Church, therefore, burdened as it is with absurd practices, instead of conforming to the word of God, does not countenance the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism. But of such authority, even if it did sustain him, the intelligent christian would be ashamed.

2. *A very large portion of the Denominations into which the christian world is divided, reject the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* The thirty millions connected with the Greek communion who, while they usually immerse, do not hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism, need not here be mentioned. Nor is it at all necessary, in order to swell the amount of human testimony on this subject, to name the more than seventy millions of

(*a*) See Salt's account of a baptism in Abysinia; also, Eusebius. (*b*) As the Abysinians, Maronites, &c. (*c*) See Tournefort's Voyage, Vol. I. (*d*) By Deylingius.

Romanists who invariably sprinkle in what they call baptism. Without these, the evidence from human testimony that immersion is not the only mode of baptism, is completely overwhelming. Of at least sixty-five millions of Protestants, more than sixty-four millions uniformly deny that immersion is the only mode of baptism. This they constantly do both in principle and practice. Many of them do not at any time immerse persons for baptism. Indeed, among Protestants, the more biblical knowledge and scriptural piety any denomination of christians, has, the less is, usually, if not uniformly, their regard for immersion even as one mode of baptism. Of all the Protestant denominations, less than one person in a hundred rejects baptism with water entirely; and about the same proportion hold that immersion is essential to baptism. When more than sixty millions of Protestant christians, many of whom are confessedly men of extensive scriptural knowledge, and devoted piety, reject immersion as the only mode of baptism, the fact becomes manifest that most of the professedly christian world turn aside from and refuse to sustain the exclusive claims of immersers.

3. *Some denominations of immersers admit that immersion is not the only mode of baptism.* One of these, the Sabeans of Syria, call themselves Daily Baptists and disciples of John the Baptist. Another, the Baptists of Holland, are called Mennonites, after Menno Simon, one of their early champions. These last have for more than one hundred years, laid aside immersion. Both these, as well as the Greek Church and some others, admit that sprinkling is baptism; though some of them habitually practice immersion. This proves that truth can find its way, a little at least, into some minds, notwithstanding the blinding influence of superstitious bigotry.

4. *The most bigoted of the exclusives do not, in fact, teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* After showing from what the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize is derived, they affirm that it signifies "to dip, plunge, immerse, imbue, drench, soak and overwhelm." Now these words are not synonymous. They do not all denote the same thing. If all the meanings of the original word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize are accurately given by them, (but they are not,) then it has

more than one signification, immersers themselves being judges. But if this word has more than one meaning, then there may be more than one mode of baptism. This will certainly be the case, unless in the word of God, one mode is specially mentioned. But so far as the use of this one word is concerned, according to their statement, *dipping* is one mode of baptism; *plunging* is another; *immersing* is another; *imbuing* another; *drenching* another; and so on. The words used by immersers to express the sense of the original word for baptize, have various significations. *To dip* is used (1.) where no fluid can be supposed to exist; as "to engage in an affair, to engage as a pledge, to enter slightly, to choose by chance, to drop by chance into any mass (*a*). A man dips into a book, when he becomes slightly acquainted with its contents. The dipping-needle is said to dip, when it moves from a perpendicular towards a horizontal position (*b*). The word dip therefore may be properly used where a single drop of water is not present. (2.) It denotes also "to put into any liquor, to moisten, to wet" generally a small part (*a*) (*c*). When a swallow dips in the pool, it wets the tips of its wings in the water. To plunge signifies "to put into any state suddenly, to hurry into any distress, to force in suddenly, to fall or rush into any hazard or distress, to put suddenly under water" (*a*). These are the principal meanings of this word. It is said of a horse, he plunges into a river, when he is forced or leaps into it carelessly, though his legs only are covered with the water. A man plunges into sin, when he engages in it with reckless perseverance. A stick is plunged into a liquid, or a sword into a man, when only a part of the stick or sword enters. *To imbue* is "to tincture deep, to infuse any tincture or dye" (*a*); and to infuse denotes to instil, infuse by drops or bring in imperceptibly; that is, to fall into or upon any thing in very small drops, or to sprinkle. *To drench* is "to soak, to steep, to saturate with drink or moisture, to physic by violence" (*a*). When a man is drenched or physicked with drink, the liquor is in him, not he in the liquor. *To soak* is "to lie steeped in moisture, to enter by degrees into pores, to drink—intemperately, to macerate in any mois-

(*a*) See Walker's Dictionary. (*b*) See Brewster's New Philosophy of Matter. (*c*) Ch. 2, § 4, par. 1.

ture, to steep, to keep wet till moisture is imbibed, to drench, to drain, to exhaust" (*a*). A log may be *soaked* in water for years and not sink below the surface in all that time. *To overwhelm* is "to crush underneath something violent and weighty, to overlook gloomily" (*a*). If stones, or earth, or a heavy rain, or sand, should, in large quantities fall on a man, he would be overwhelmed. But to force him against or even under any of these, would not *over*whelm him. *To immerse* is "to sink or cover deep, to depress," as well as "to put under water" (*a*). When therefore immersers themselves define the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, they do not teach that immersion, in their sense of the term, is the only mode of baptism. Even the inelegant Latin word (*immersio*) modified into immerse, in the use of which they take so much delight, is not exclusively confined, either in Latin or English, to one meaning. When the significations of the words used by immersers to define the original one (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, are accurately examined, they teach that, among other things, it denotes to wet a small part, to descend, to touch water, to sprinkle, to fall upon, &c. Strange, that men with such language on their lips, should still insist that in baptism, the person must always be put entirely under water!

5. *Immersers do not pretend that the word baptize expresses the whole of what they do in immersion.* The action which they perform in immersion, is eight-fold (*b*). Two parts of this action are so essential to it, that it cannot exist without them. These are putting the parts of the person not before wet, under water, and taking him up out of it again (*b*). No immerser pretends that the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, or its root (Βαπτω,) always and necessarily denotes both these parts of immersion. They do not pretend that baptize *ever expresses* them both. Immersers, with all their learning, and ignorance, and learned ignorance, have never pretended to discover in the Greek (Βαπτιζω) or English word baptize, but a very small part of what they do in immersion. If the word baptize always signified to put entirely under water, instead of seldom or never having that meaning; even this would not authorize them to perform all the other parts connected with immersion. They would not

(*a*) See Walker's Dictionary. (*b*) See B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4.

thereby be authorized to perform even the two parts which are indispensable to it, and without both which, it cannot exist. If "compliance must be so, and no more, and no less, and no otherwise" (*a*), and this principle seems to be correct, then in immersion, they do not render obedience; for they do more than they pretend the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize ever means. If they will neither do more nor less, than what they say the word means, then they will not wade into the water or raise up the person after he is put under its surface. To do this, is to do more than what the word means, according to their own assertions in relation to the original term. They do more than they say it means; and therefore, as they themselves decide, do not render obedience. They do not practice according to their own rule. They do not conform, even in a tolerable degree, to what they say the word signifies. The word for baptize in Greek, is very far from ever denoting even the two essential parts of the action performed by them in immersion (*b*), and much less the whole eight parts, of which this action is usually composed. It may be well doubted whether any word in any language has this complicated signification (*c*). When the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, or its root (Βαπτω,) or any other word in the Greek language, does not signify the whole or even the greater part of what they do in immersion; how absurd to talk of that being the only mode of baptism!! When this word (Βαπτιζω) in the scriptures is not once definitely used to denote any part or even any portion of any part, of what is done in immersion; to expect an intelligent believer in Divine revelation, who has examined this subject, to believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism, is to suppose that such a person can believe without evidence. It is to fancy him to be an infant in intellect; or that he can be made to take assertion for proof.

6. *Immersers do not put the person immersed entirely under water.* The person himself generally, if not always, wades or enters into the water some distance. In this way, a considerable part of the subject is, by his own act, covered or wet with water. The part which is thus wet, is immersed

(*a*) See Pedo. Exam. by Mr. Boothe, Vol. I. (*b*) B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4, par. 4. 5. (*c*) This compound idea, or even the two-fold idea that is essential to immersion, is not attached to any word in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, Ethiopic, Arabic, French, Spanish, Italian or English.

by himself, not by the preacher who immerses the remainder of the body. The subject performs one part of the immersion; the preacher the other. It is manifest therefore; that, since the administrator immerses but one part of the person immersed, only one part of him is properly immersed, unless he has a right to immerse one part, while the preacher does the other. Besides, this semi-self immersion is not performed in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Now if a man without authority, can, in no name, perform properly this half immersion of himself; he might, one would suppose, on the same grounds, immerse himself without the preacher's assistance. If the preacher only has a right to immerse, and if he must perform this act in the name of the Trinity; then that part of the body which the person himself immerses in no name whatever, cannot be properly immersed; for that part is not immersed by the preacher; is not immersed in the name of the Trinity. Since, when a person is immersed; the immerser puts only a part of the body under water; he, if immersion was baptism, could be only half baptized. It is a wonder that the advocates of the opinion, that for baptism, a person *must be put* entirely under water, do not take up the subject and, after holding him above the surface, at least for an instant, so that all present might see that he was fairly out of it, put him entirely under its surface. By doing this, they would act according to their professed principles. But none of them do this. None of them usually, if ever, put more than a part of the immersed under water, the other part being immersed by the subject himself. It appears therefore that if to be baptized, a person must be put entirely under water, then modern immersers in western Europe and in America only half baptize their followers.

7. *In being immersed, a person is seldom entirely in contact with the water.* His clothes are generally put entirely under water by himself and the operator; and usually most parts of them are wet. But where the dress is tight, especially round the waist; the water does not and cannot penetrate through the garments, during the moment they are under the water. This partial wetting, immersers admit to be baptism. If the washing or wetting of the whole person is

essential to baptism; then very few of the immersed, particularly of those who wear the over-dress(*a*), are baptized. But if water applied by a minister to a part of the body, in the name of the Trinity, is baptism; then sprinkling, as this is water thus applied to a part of the body, must be baptism. If it be said that the intention of the parties renders this partial application of water, valid in their case; it may be remarked that if this Romish principle will answer in their case; it may, at least in their estimation, answer as well in the case of those who intend to administer baptism by sprinkling. It is manifest therefore that, both in theory(*b*) and practice, immersers, notwithstanding their loud professions to the contrary, admit that water applied to a part of the person, or, which is the same thing in fact, that a part of the person applied to the water, is valid baptism. By their own admissions and practices therefore, their exclusive system is overthrown.

CHAPTER IV.

SEVERAL MATTERS OFTEN SUPPOSED TO RELATE TO IMMERSION.

1. *In the early ages of the church, washing preceded baptism.* This washing was sometimes partial and sometimes it extended over the whole person. At first it was practiced for the sake of cleanliness. The subject, occasionally at least, was washed in a state of entire nudity(*c*). Immersers and even others, sometimes mistake this washing for baptism. But where it existed, it always preceded and was really distinct from the ordinance of baptism. It had not necessarily, in fact, any more connection with that sacrament than a washing to remove bodily defilement at the present day, would have with baptism. The writers who mention this washing(*d*) sustain this position. Some of them do this very clearly, and others less so. This practice may have originated in persons supposing that a literal washing for cleansing was intended by such language as the following:

(*a*) An over-dress is a dress which many modern immersers put on over their other clothes when they are put under the water as a substitute for baptism. (*b*) § 4. (*c*) See Robinson's and Wall's Hist. (*d*) See Cyprian, Augustine and other ancient writers.

"Ye are washed;"—"our bodies washed;"—Christ—cleansed the church "with the washing of water;"—the washing of regeneration;"* and the like. But the washings here mentioned were ceremonial or spiritual. If they were spiritual, then they could not be performed with water; for spiritual cleansing or the removing of the guilt or pollution of sin from the soul cannot be effected by applying water to the body(*a*). If they were ceremonial, then they were or might have been performed by sprinkling, as ceremonial washings usually, if not universally were.† But the practice of washing before baptism, whatever might have been its origin, cannot sustain the notion that immersion is the only mode of administering that ordinance.

This washing which was sometimes partial and sometimes extended over the whole body, preceded the ordinance of baptism. Though it constituted no part of that sacrament, yet it soon became invested with a kind of superstitious regard. In the third century, it was viewed as a general prerequisite to baptism; so much so that many persons maintained, that before the ordinance was administered either to infants or adults, the person to be baptized ought to be first washed. But still this washing was in reality no part of the ordinance of baptism. It is very possible however, indeed it may be probable, that some persons becoming more ignorant, bigoted and superstitious than others, occasionally substituted this washing in the room of baptism. But even this substitution, if it did at any time take place, could not change this washing into baptism. However, in after ages, immersion, among ignorant and superstitious men, may have received some countenance from these superstitious washings. But if they had, at their first origin in the third century, been substituted for baptism; they could not, even in that case, prove that immersion was then the only mode of baptism; for these washings were not baptism and were often partial.

2. *Ancient monumental pictures and engravings do not teach that immersion is the only or even a mode of baptism.* More than fifty of these have been preserved. These have come down to the present day. The motto on some of them is in Greek; that on others is in Latin. They mark the

*1 Cor. 6: 11, Heb. 10: 22, Eph. 5: 26, Tit. 3: 5. (*a*) See P. i. Ch. 4, § 5, B. i. P. iv, Ch. 1, § 16. †See Lev. 14: 7. 16, 27, Num. 8: 7, and 19: 4. 13. 18. 19. 20, Heb. 9: 13. 19. 21. &c.

mode of baptism from about the year A. D. 300, till A. D. 1100(*a*). They were made by different artists in different ages and countries. To ascertain the meaning of these pictures and engravings, a person has only to open his eyes. They speak a language which all can understand. In these the person who baptizes is, in no instance, represented as being in the water when he administers the ordinance. Nor do we find the least intimation in the word of God, that John or any other person, stood in the water while he administered baptism. In this then, as well as in other points, these monuments of antiquity agree with Divine revelation. In all these, the water is represented as being applied to the person, not the person to the water. The person baptized is sometimes represented as standing nearly or quite up to the waist in water, and sometimes as standing in a bath; but he is much more frequently represented as standing during his baptism, on the ground or on the floor. In not one instance however is he represented as being put under the water for baptism. It is moreover manifest from these monuments that standing in the water formed no part of the ordinance of baptism; because if this was a part of it; then the ordinance could not have been, as it often was according to these representations, administered while the person baptized was standing on the ground or on the floor. Since some of those whose baptism is represented in these monuments of antiquity, were baptized while entirely out of the water, as the representations themselves clearly show; being in the water, could not in their case have been an essential part or indeed any part of their baptism. As these representations do not show, or intimate that a single person, during the ages in which they were made, was immersed for baptism; so they do not, cannot teach that immersion is the only mode of administering that ordinance. These plain speakers then, whose language defies criticism, do not give testimony in favor of immersion.

3. *The marble font in the cathedral at Syracuse in Sicily, does not show that immersion is the only mode of baptism. (b).* It is said(*c*) that this font was used by Marcion who lived about the year A. D. 200. But its existence about the

(*a*) See note (*a*) B. iii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 5, for authorities. (*b*) See Sicilian Inscriptions, class 17, No. 1. (*c*) By Taylor and others.

year A. D. 300, is certain. It is small, has two handles, is about twelve inches deep, may contain about two gallons, and has on it an inscription in Greek, which, in a free translation may be rendered into English thus; "Zosimus(*a*) dedicates to God this sacred vase for the purpose of holy baptism"(*b*). Certainly in this baptismal font, adult persons could not have been immersed. The existence of this vessel to be used as a baptismal font, proves conclusively that at, and during the time it was so used; immersion could not possibly have been the only mode of baptism practiced by the christian church.

4. *The exclusive claims of immersers, do not prove theirs to be the only mode of baptism.* Unsupported claims are frequently made. These are sometimes exclusive. Indeed, it may almost be laid down as a general rule, that the farther persons wander from the word of God as the only rule in all religious duties; the more exclusive and dogmatical they become. But in Popery and High Church Episcopacy, it is clearly exhibited. These do not even pretend to take the scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice in all religious duties; and yet, each is so exclusive as to hold very strenuously, that no society of christians can constitute a branch of the church of Christ, unless Diocesan Episcopacy forms one of its essential ingredients; though this is not so much as once named in the word of God. Immersers are so exclusive that, in the estimation of many of them; no class of christians constitutes a church or a branch of the church of Christ, unless its members have been immersed as a substitute for baptism; though this is not once mentioned as baptism in the whole of God's book. The resemblance among these exclusives, is manifest. But all these unsupported claims, do not prove that Diocesan Episcopacy is essential to church organization; or that immersion is essential to baptism. It does not even prove that immersion is that holy ordinance. Should it be admitted that a few of these different classes of exclusives are pious and learned men;

(*a*)Zosimus was made Bishop of Rome in the year A. D. 417, as we learn from church history. (*b*)The original is this; αναθημα ιερου βαπτισματος Ζοσιμου θεω δωρουντος τον κρατερα αγιον. Literally this may be translated; "The dedicated present of Zosimus who gives this sacred vessel to God for the purpose of holy baptism."

the facts in the case would be still the same. Even the exclusive claims of these, however dogmatically asserted, cannot make Episcopacy scriptural church government; nor immersion, the baptism taught in God's own holy book.

5. *To call immersion a cross does not prove it to be the only mode of baptism.* When Christ requires a person to perform a duty which, for some cause, may, at the time, be disagreeable to him; the performance of it under such circumstances, may be called a cross. To make a particular action a cross, it must be a duty positively required in God's word; and it must, from some cause or causes, be disagreeable to the person at the time it is to be performed. But what is not positively commanded in the scriptures, cannot be made a christian's cross. What God does not command, may be a cross which Satan, the world or men, may require us to bear; but this last cross is essentially different from that which Christ directs his people to "take up" and "bear."* To "bear" the cross which he commands us to take up, is essential to christianity. Without doing this, no person can be a true child of God. Our Saviour himself has determined this point. He says, "whosoever doth not bear his cross cannot be my disciple."† Whatever cross Christ requires us to "take up" and "bear," ought to be borne cheerfully in obedience to his command. Satan, the world or men may direct us to do what is not required in God's word. Obedience to their mandate may not be pleasant to us. They may call what they require, a cross in order to induce us to obey. But we ought to know, that such a cross is only a creature's invention; not a cross which Christ requires us to bear. To take up a cross of the creature's invention, is not to serve, but to disobey, the Redeemer of sinners. To call that a cross which God in his word does not require, cannot make it such. But in the scriptures, men are not required to be immersed(*a*); therefore immersion cannot be that cross which every "disciple" must "bear."‡ Besides, to be put entirely under water is, or is not, a cross according to the temperature of the weather. (*b*) Whether an act is, or is not, a cross of Christ, does

*Mat. 16: 24, Mark 8: 34, Luke 9: 23. †Luke 14: 27. *(a)* See P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–8. ‡Luke 14: 27. *(b)* It is a well known fact that persons in warm weather frequently go entirely under water merely for amusement. This act then, at such a season, cannot be a cross to them.

not, however, depend upon the temperature of the weather, or on the change of the seasons. As therefore immersion is not required in the word of God; and as it is, or is not, a cross according to the temperature of the weather, so it cannot be a cross which Christ commands his disciples to bear. To call it a cross, when God does not, may deceive men, but cannot deceive Omniscience. It is manifest from these remarks, that to call immersion a cross, cannot prove it to be the only mode of baptism.

6. *Immersion cannot be a sign of what is signified in baptism.* Christian baptism signifies the work of the Holy Spirit on the soul(*a*). When the operations of the Spirit are mentioned, whatever may be their degree or kind, the person is, in no passage of scripture, said to be immersed in the Holy Ghost, or to be put under or even into the Spirit. If these operations of the Spirit, or ev n any part of them, were represented as being by immersion, then external immersion might be a sign of them. But as no part of the Spirit's operations, is said to be by immersion, or by putting the person into or under the Holy Ghost; so literal immersion cannot represent any portion of them. Literal immersion might represent spiritual immersion. But, as the work of the Spirit is not, either wholly or in part, said in scripture to be by immersion; so immersion under water, cannot be a sign of the whole or of any part of the Spirit's operations. The Spirit, in his operations, is often said to be "poured out" upon men; and persons are represented as being "filled with the Holy Ghost,"* when his converting, sanctifying or supernatural influences are enjoyed in an unusual degree. When the Spirit is "poured out" upon persons, or they are "filled with" his influences, the Spirit is in or upon them; but they are certainly not put under or immersed all over in the Spirit. When the Spirit enters into and fills a man, that man then is not put entirely into or under the Spirit. That which falls upon a person may be a sign of the outpouring of the Spirit on him. But to put him *under* water cannot possibly be a sign of what *falls* on him; because to fall upon, be poured out upon, or be filled with, does not, in the least degree, resemble immersion. As the influences of the Spirit, which are "poured out"—"shed"—"fall upon"

(*a*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. *Prov. 1: 23, Isa. 32: 15, Joel 2: 28, Acts 2: 4, 17.

or fill the soul,* are symbolized by baptism ; so immersion in which water is not poured out or shed, and does not fall upon the person immersed, cannot be a sign of these operations of the Holy Ghost.

It may also be remarked here, that immersion cannot symbolize the death of Christ. He suffered on the cross ; and there is no possible resemblance between the death of a person while suspended on the cross, several feet above the earth, and being put entirely under water in immersion. Nor can it be a sign of, or symbolize his burial. He was laid in a "tomb" "hewn out of a rock,"† not in water. Immersion cannot be a sign or token by which his burial is represented ; for there is no resemblance between the two actions(*a*). In his resurrection, his human soul and body were re-united. This is what is always included in the language when the resurrection of a dead body is mentioned. Without this re-union of soul and body, no resurrection can take place. With it, there is a resurrection from the dead. This is in fact what constitutes a resurrection of the dead. That exercise of Divine power by which the human body and soul of Christ were re-united on the third day after his death, had nothing in it which, in any particular, resembles the going or the putting of a living person entirely under water. Nor did the resurrection of Christ from the dead, or in other words, the re-union of his human soul and body, resemble, in the least degree, the raising of a living person from under the water ; and this act is one essential part of what is done in immersion(*b*). Immersion therefore, in any of its parts, or in them all united, cannot be a sign of, or symbolize the resurrection of Christ, or the re-union, by Omnipotent power, of his human soul and body. Immersion does not in the least, resemble, and therefore cannot symbolize his departure out of the tomb. To walk, in any way, out of the tomb in which he had been laid, could no more be represented or symbolized by immersion in any of its parts, than to walk out of one room into another, or out of a house into the street, can be signified or represented by putting a person under water and then taking him out from under it again. To suppose that our Saviour's departure out of his

*Tit. 3: 6, Acts 2: 4 and 10: 44, 45 and 11: 15–18. †Mat. 27: 60, Mark 15: 46. (*a*) P. i, Ch. 4, § 2. (*b*) See B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4, par. 5.

tomb, which was a small room hewn out of a rock, can be symbolized by raising a person up from under water, is manifestly absurd(*a*). Coming out of such a tomb, or out of a house, cannot, surely, appear to any reflecting person, like going into and under the water, and then being immediately raised up again from under its surface. But as baptism was not instituted to represent, symbolize, or be a sign of these or of any of them; so farther remarks here in relation to them, are unnecessary. It is manifest however, that as the influences of the Spirit represented by baptism, descended upon persons; so thrusting them entirely under water in immersion and immediately taking them from under its surface again, cannot be a sign of, or symbolize these operations of the Holy Ghost.*

7. *The command to baptize is not limited to any place; nor does it require water to be brought in any particular way.* When Christ directs his ministering servants to "teach all nations, baptizing them,"† he does not inform them in what particular way, water is to be obtained for that purpose. Nor does he require them to administer the ordinance in any particular place. He does not say, whether the water is to be brought in a bowl in the hand, or in a hogshead on a cart to fill a cistern. He gives us no direction as to the mode in which the water is to be brought to the place where it is to be used. Indeed, this, even in the estimation of immersers, can hardly be considered an essential part of baptism. Moreover, the practice of the apostles clearly shows that the place where baptism is administered, or the mode in which the water is procured, constitutes no part of that ordinance. Nor would the fact that immersers fill a cistern with water, drawn in very large vessels, prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. It may be remarked also, that as the act of bringing the water to be used in baptism, is not one of religious worship; so no person ought to be surprized when he finds that nothing is said on that particular point in the scriptures. Nor would a single remark have been here made upon it, if immersers did not sometimes, when driven by argument from every other ground, attempt to sustain the claims of immersion by saying that no person can show scriptural evidence to prove that water was brought in a bowl into a

(*a*) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 4, § 3, (note *b*) par, 3, *See John 1: 32, †Mat. 28: 19.

house to be used for the purpose of baptizing persons. This demand shows that they fancy that the mode of bringing water to be used in baptism, is a part of, or essential to the ordinance. And if it is, they ought to be prepared to prove their position, and to show that water, for this purpose, must be drawn on a cart in sufficient quantities to fill a cistern, in order that immersion might be practiced. But all such statements do not prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. They only prove that immersers feel how absolutely impossible it is to sustain, with any thing like tolerable evidence, the exclusive claims of their system. To suppose that, because it is not stated in the word of God, that water was brought in a bowl to be used in baptism, proves immersion to be the only mode, is that kind of trifling which ought to make even an immerser blush. But certainly no person of common reflection could possibly believe that this would sustain the position that immersion is the only, or even a mode of baptism.

PART THIRD.

WHY PERSONS ARE IMMERSED.

CHAPTER I.

THE IMMERSED TURN ASIDE FROM THE WORD OF GOD.

1. *Facts prove this position.* That immersers, on this subject, turn aside from the word of God, appears, (1.) From *the fact* that the scriptures, in no one passage(*a*), teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism; (2.) From *the fact* that the word immerse or immersion for baptize or for baptism, is not once found in the whole book of God(*b*), either in the original or in any proper translation; and (3.) From *the fact* that no person is, in Divine revelation, said to be immersed, or is required to immerse others for baptism or for any other purpose. That *these are facts*, any person can learn by reading the scriptures. It is manifest then that those who adopt immersion as the only, or even as a mode of baptism, must turn aside from the word of God.

2. *The language of immersers proves that, on this subject, they turn aside from the word of God.* When asked, why

(*a*) See P. i, Ch. 5, § 1–6. (*b*) See P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–8.

they adopt the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism; they generally, if not universally, give one or more of the following statements as an answer. They often say; (1.) That they know some good man who believes that immersion is the only mode of baptism; (2.) That they felt very solemn on a certain occasion when they saw some person immersed; (3.) That their conscience teaches them that immersion is the right mode of baptism; (4.) That many persons in the neighborhood have been or are about to be immersed; (5.) That they were always taught, by some good men, that immersion is the only mode of baptism; (6.) That their parents, who were christians, believed in this mode of baptism; (7.) That this seems to them to be the only mode of baptism; (8.) That the other mode has become antiquated, while this modern mode shows the march of mind. These, and similar reasons, are given as the evidence by which they are led to be immersed, or to believe in that substitute for baptism. But as their conscience is not the rule of duty; and as all these notions merely turn aside the mind from the scriptures, which are the only rule of duty for christians, in all religious matters; so they prove that immersers, in adopting immersion as the only mode of baptism, turn aside from the word of God. These fancies ought to be all rejected. They really compose no part of the christian's duty. "To the law and to the testimony,"* all ought to come for religious instruction on this and on every other subject.

3. *The immersed do not examine the foundation on which immersion builds its exclusive claims* This is (1.) The groundless assumption that the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, always means immerse(*a*). That there is no ground for such an assumption, is manifest to any person who has even a tolerable acquaintance with the meaning of this word either in Greek or English, as it is used either in the scriptures or in other books. (2.) Immersers do not understand, or they designedly misrepresent the meaning of the prepositions (εις) into, (εκ) out of, (απο) from, and (εν) with(*b*). They seem to imagine that the use of these words must certainly prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

*Isa. 8: 20. (*a*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 7, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. 5, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1–4. (*b*) P. i, Ch. 3, § 2–8.

But such expressions do not even intimate that immersion is one mode of baptism. It is certain therefore that they cannot teach that it is the only mode. Immersers seem to fancy that there is a resemblance between immersion and being buried with Christ by "baptism into death" on the cross. But between these, there is not the least resemblance(*a*). It appears therefore that immersion, even as a mode of baptism, is obliged to depend for support on a mere assumption, on a mistake or misrepresentation, and on a fancy. These often lead persons blindfolded into the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism. By neglecting to examine the real evidence upon which immersion builds its exclusive claims, many persons are deceived into the adoption of the system.

4. *Few, if any persons, can turn to any one passage of scripture and say; this taught me that immersion is baptism.* No expression in scripture, either in the literal or figurative sense of the language, teaches immersion to be even a mode of baptism. To say that the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, in the scriptures denotes immerse, is mere assertion or fancy. No such signification is, in the whole of Divine revelation, given to this word. The connection in no one passage, shows this to be its definite signification. As such a meaning for the word (Βαπτιζω) is only found in the fancies of persons, so but few who examine the scriptures, can be led to imagine that the word baptize, in that holy book, really means immerse. But few can therefore turn to any portion of the Divine word, and show *that* as the evidence which teaches them to believe in immersion as a mode of baptism which they suppose is therein taught.

5. *No one ever found immersion as the only mode of baptism, taught in the scriptures of truth.* The reason is simply this; not the least evidence of any kind in favor of immersion being the only mode of baptism, is found in scripture. To this, there is not the most distant allusion made in the whole word of God. There is not the least intimation given in it that immersion is essential to baptism. This notion has nothing in God's word to sustain it even in appearance. This holy book says nothing that the most unrestrained or misguided fancy could torture into the notion that immersion

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 4, § 2.

is the only mode of baptism. The language of scripture contains no literal, no figurative, no fanciful meaning to sustain immersers in their exclusive claims. No one could therefore ever find, in the scriptures, any kind or degree of evidence to prove, even to his own imagination, that immersion is the only mode of baptism(*a*).

CHAPTER II.

THE IMMERSED MISTAKE THE POINT TO BE PROVED.

1. *What the point to be proved is, ought to be kept in mind.* This is not whether immersion is, or is not, a mode of baptism; but the point is, whether it is, or is not, the only mode(*b*). That immersion is the only mode of baptism, is what immersers assert. This is a very different position from the assertion that immersion is baptism, or one mode of baptism. This point ought to be kept before the mind in order that it may be fairly investigated.

2. *Persons frequently mistake this point.* They adopt immersion simply as a mode of baptism; not as the only mode. From the supposition that they are to be immersed, merely as a preferable mode of baptism, they go into and allow themselves to be put under the water. They afterwards, perhaps, discover that, by taking this step, they have really, in their practice at least, adopted the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Having been blindly led to take this step; a desire to justify their own practice, or a wish to appear consistent, or to justify the course of their party, will usually soon induce them to insist that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Having taken the first false step, they are the more easily persuaded to take the second. Thus they become entangled in the mazes of error. They are first immersed without finding either precept or example in the word of God for going under the water; and then they are easily led, without a shadow of proof, to assert that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Thus they are frequently induced to be immersed merely as a mode of baptism; and then they are led to adopt, as a second part of the same lesson, the notion that immersion is the only mode of

(*a*) See P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–9. P. i, Ch. 2, § 1–4, P. i, Ch. 3, § 1–10, P. i, Ch. 4, § 1–5.
(*b*) See B. i, P. vii, Ch. 2, § 1–4.

baptism. This is mere deception. But multitudes are, by this kind of Jesuitism, induced to unite with immersers and adopt their exclusive system.

CHAPTER III.

IMMERSERS OFTEN MISTAKE ASSERTIONS FOR PROOF.

1. *Immersers often assert that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* This assertion is frequently made by them with the most unblushing assurance, though there is not, in the word of God or in Greek writers(*a*), the least shadow of evidence to sustain it. These positive assertions, many mistake for proof; and more suppose that men professing to be religious teachers, would not make such unqualified statements without the least evidence to support them. Many, by these their positive assertions, totally unsupported by any evidence whatever, are induced to adopt immersion as the only mode of baptism.

2. *The assertion that, sometimes ministers of other denominations, unite with immersers, is often mistaken for evidence that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* But this simply proves that these men, notwithstanding their professions, have not carefully examined this subject. If, however, they, at first, either through ignorance or from design, had deceived others in this matter; it might be difficult to determine whether, after their professed change of opinion, they were entirely worthy of all confidence, even so far as their own assertions are concerned. Besides, at least as many forsake the ranks of immersers to join others, as forsake others to join immersers. It is manifest therefore that a few persons who may unite themselves with immersers, after they have been members of other denominations of professing christians, do not and cannot, by their assertions, prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. The assertions of such persons are really no better evidence than those of other immersers. Perhaps they are not quite so good proof as the declarations of those who have not like them, either from ignorance or design, turned aside from truth and adopted the unscriptural notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 5, § 4, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1-8, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1. 2. 4.

3. *They often assert that Christ and the Eunuch were immersed.* That this is mere assertion without proof, is evident to any one who will only read what the Spirit of God teaches in relation to their baptism(*a*). It is not said that either of them was put under the water, or was taken up from under, or came up from under, the water.* Neither of the two actions which are essential to immersion, is mentioned as being performed either by or for Christ or the Eunuch(*b*). To say that they were immersed is therefore mere assertion without proof.

4. *Immersers seldom attempt to prove their position.* They assert that immersion is *a mode*, the *only mode* of baptism. This they seldom or never attempt to prove. They find it much more convenient to make such an assertion than to sustain it by even the appearance of evidence from the word of God. But before they ask any person to believe their exclusive assertion to be true; they ought to prove its truth by the express language of Divine revelation. But they seldom attempt to do this. They very seldom undertake to show from God's word that immersion is a mode, much less that it is the only mode of baptism. Instead of attempting to prove their position, like men who honestly supposed they had good evidence for that purpose; instead of bringing forward positive proof to sustain the exclusive claims of their system, as they are bound to do before they can reasonably ask men of sense to adopt the notion that immersion and that only is baptism; they, as if they knew and felt the weakness of their own cause, turn round and begin to question others. They thus put these last on defending themselves. This is done in order to prevent them from requiring evidence, plain and pointed, in favor of the exclusive claims of immersion. In this way the eyes of not a few are blinded. Immersers seldom or never attempt to bring forward any pointed proof to show that immersion is the only mode or even one mode of baptism. To assert this and suppose it needs no proof, is much more convenient for them. This plan will also deceive many, much more effectually than awkward attempts to prove that in favor of which there is no evidence. They can accomplish this, too, with much

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 2, § 1–4, P. i, Ch. 3, § 2. 5. 7. *See Mat. 3: 16, Acts 8: 38. 39 in Greek and English. (*b*) B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4, par. 4. 5.

more ease than they could attempt the impossible task of naming the book, chapter and verse in Divine revelation, which teaches that immersion is a mode or the only mode of baptism. This total want of evidence in favor of immersion in the word of God, bore so hard upon their exclusive system that, to escape from the dilemma into which they were brought by it, they even altered the scriptures of truth so as to make an immersion bible for themselves(*a*). By this and similar management, they show that they feel the entire insufficiency of the evidence on which they attempt to erect their exclusive system. But notwithstanding this, not a few are deceived by this sophistry. By it, numbers are induced to go *under*, instead of *to* or *into* the water, as was the case in one or two, out of the many instances of baptism mentioned in scripture. They submit to be applied to the water, instead of having the baptismal water applied to them.

Moreover, when scriptural evidence to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism, is demanded, it is often asserted that there is as much evidence for immersion as there is for sprinkling. This assertion admits that sprinkling, as a mode of baptism, is supported by as good evidence as immersion is. It therefore destroys the exclusive claims of immersers ; for if sprinkling is a mode of baptism ; if it is supported by as good evidence as immersion is, then immersion cannot be the only mode of baptism ; and that it is such, is the position which the exclusives on this subject always take. If it was a fact therefore that there is as much evidence in favor of immersion, as there is for sprinkling, it would not prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism. If the scriptures contained no evidence for sprinkling, if they even declared that sprinkling is not a mode of baptism, no proof would even then be thus furnished to show that immersion is baptism or the only mode of administering that ordinance. If sprinkling water upon a person in the name of the Trinity, is not baptism, it by no means follows as a necessary consequence or even as a fair inference, that immersion is the only mode. By adopting such sophistry, immersers show that they feel how totally destitute their system is of substantial evidence for its support.

(*a*) See P. ii, Ch. 3, § 9, (note *a*,) par. 7.

5. *They often assume an inference, and mistake this for proof.* They say, the Eunuch was immersed, because he went into the water. This is assuming for truth a mere inference; and an inference too not found in the premises. It by no means follows that, if the Eunuch went into the water, he was therefore immersed. Many persons go into, without going under water. Perhaps a thousand persons go into water without going or being put under it, for one that goes into it for the purpose of being immersed. But this their assumed inference, though in reality it is mere assertion, is often mistaken for proof that immersion is the only mode of baptism. And in this way, some are led under the water as a substitute for christian baptism.

PART FOURTH.

THE ORIGIN AND EVILS OF IMMERSION.

CHAPTER I.

WHEN IMMERSION AS THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM DID NOT ORIGINATE.

1. *Immersion did not originate with the Apostles.* Immersion as baptism, or rather as a *substitute for* baptism, did not originate with the apostles; because they did not immerse for that or for any other purpose(*a*). Immersion could not therefore have originated with them. Neither of the Greek words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) which occasionally denote immerse, is used to express any ordinance administered by the apostles. There is not therefore the least shadow of evidence to prove that immersion had its origin with the apostles of our Saviour.

2. *Immersion did not originate with John the Baptist.* This position is proved from the fact that he did not immerse. (*b*). It is repeatedly stated that he baptized; but it is not asserted, in a single passage in the whole scriptures, that he immersed. Neither of the two words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) which in Greek sometimes signify immerse, is used to express what John did when he baptized the Jews. Besides, John baptized in a different mode(*c*). He baptized "*with* water,"* not *under* that element. He who baptizes "*with*

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–8. (*b*) P. i, Ch. 7, § 6. (*c*) See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 2, § 1. 4. *Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8. &c.

water," does not immerse. To baptize "*with* water," is to apply the fluid to a person. To immerse is to apply the person *to*, and then thrust him entirely *under* the water(*a*). John baptized *with*, not *under*, water. It cannot therefore be true that he immersed. Nor can it hence be possible that immersion originated with him.

3. *Immersion did not originate among the Jews as one of their ceremonial washings.* These are not, in any passage of scripture, called immersion or immersions(*b*). These are collectively called baptisms.* But in no instance are they all, or is any one of them said to be performed by immersion. Whenever the mode of performing these their ceremonial washings or baptisms, is mentioned, it is always said to have been by sprinkling, never by immersion(*b*). To say therefore that the Jews performed their Divinely appointed ceremonial washings or baptisms, by immersion, is manifestly mere assertion. To make such a declaration would be to speak without evidence. Such a statement would be contrary to undeniable facts. It cannot therefore be that immersion originated with the Jews at or before the death of Christ.

4. *This ceremony did not originate with the Lord Jesus Christ.* The scriptures do not teach that he immersed or directed others to immerse persons for baptism or for any other purpose (*c*). He baptized and directed his ministering servants to baptize others.† But it is not stated in the original scriptures, nor in any accurate translation, that he himself immersed or that he directed others to do so. It is worse than trifling then to suppose that immersion originated with the blessed Redeemer.

5. *Immersion did not originate at or before the time of the Apostles.* No Greek word which, even frequently, denotes immerse, is used in the scriptures for baptism. Of the two words (εμβαπτω and εμβαπτιζω) which frequently, though not in the word of God, express immerse, or the putting of what is mentioned entirely under water, neither is, at any time, in the original, used for baptism. If the Holy Spirit had intended to teach mankind that immersion is the only

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 3, § 6, B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4. (*b*) See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 1, § 2, 3. *See Mark 7: 4, Luke 11: 38, Heb. 9: 10. 13. 19. 21 in Greek. (*c*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–6. †See Mat. 28: 19, John 3: 22. 26.

mode, or even a mode of baptism, certainly one of the words denoting immerse, or both, would have been used as often as once at least, for baptize. But this is not the case. No word which in the original, usually signifies immerse, is, in any one passage, used for baptism or baptize. The word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, is not, itself, so connected with other words in a single passage, in the original scriptures, as to require it to signify immerse(*a*); nor is it intimated that immerse is its only signification, or even one of its meanings. (*b*). There is therefore no evidence that immersion originated in the days of the apostles or before. It may be left to immersers to believe, or rather profess to believe, that for which the word of God furnishes not the least evidence. Men who take the scriptures for their only rule of duty in every part of their religion, must beg to be excused from following the mere conjecture of their fellow creatures. They do not choose to adopt that as the only mode of baptism, which is not so much as once mentioned in the whole word of God, even as one mode by which that ordinance may be administered.

6. *Immersion did not originate with the early Greek Fathers.* These frequently mention baptism. But when they do so, they use the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize; but in no instance do they use, to denote this ordinance, either of the words (εμβαπτιζω or εμβαπτω) which often signify immerse(*c*). Since they did not use a word for baptize which usually signifies immerse, it cannot with the least propriety, be supposed that with them originated the opinion that immersion is a mode or the only mode of baptism. Modern immersers frequently speak in the most unequivocal language on this subject. They do not hesitate to use the word immerse. The early Greek Fathers do not, for baptize, use a word which generally denotes immerse. If these Fathers and modern immersers mean the same thing; their mode of expressing it is exceedingly different!!! It cannot, therefore, be even conjectured with any degree of probability, that immersion, as the only, or even as a mode of baptism, originated with the early Greek Fathers. As immersion for baptism is not mentioned in the word of God, nor in the wri-

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 8. (*b*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 7. (*c*) P. ii, Ch. 2, § 2.

tings of any of the early Greek Fathers; it must be sought for elsewhere. It is certain to those who examine the subject carefully, that immersion, as the only, or even as a mode of baptism, was unknown in the days when "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" because the word immerse, or a Greek word denoting it, is not used in the scriptures for baptism or for baptize. For the same reason, it is certain that immersion for baptism was unknown in the early ages of the church.

CHAPTER II.

WHEN AND WHERE IMMERSION, AS THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM, ORIGINATED.

1. *Immersion as a mode of baptism originated in the dark ages.* From about the year A. D. 700, till about the year A. D. 1500, moral and spiritual darkness spread a fearful gloom over the world. The light of revelation was almost extinguished. Immorality threw its withering curse over almost every portion of Christendom. Iniquity, like a desolating tide of liquid fire, spread its blighting influence over the nations. "Darkness" covered "the earth," and "gross darkness the people." Ignorance was almost universally prevalent. True science had but few advocates, and true religion, scarcely any. Those centuries during which ignorance and unbridled wickedness prevailed and exercised a domineering influence over the minds of men, are emphatically called "THE DARK AGES." During these ages of spiritual desolation, immersion, as a mode of baptism, had its origin. Between the years A. D. 1110 and 1150, a few persons among the Albigenses and Waldenses, adopted, as is supposed by some, the opinion that immersion is a mode of baptism. These were few in number and continued but a short time. They adopted the opinion that infants cannot be saved. They were called Petrobrussians, after their leader Peter De Bruys. It is supposed, though it is not certain, that this little, short-lived, fanatical sect, sometimes practiced immersion as a substitute for baptism(*a*). But there is no evidence that any even of these fancied it to be the *only mode*

(*a*) Among their various fancies they adopted several important truths. See Buck, Marsh, p. 231, Sketches of Sectarianism, No. 3.

of baptism. Some of them rejected baptism entirely, as the Quakers and others do at present(*a*). This is the earliest definite intimation given in Ecclesiastical history of any thing like immersion being practiced for baptism. The word baptize is often, before this date, used to express this holy ordinance; but before this, no word is expressly used for it, which universally or even generally denotes immerse.

2. *In the Greek Church, immersion for baptism, originated in the dark ages.* The Greek or Eastern church separated from the Latin or Western, about the year 1050. It has a greater extent of territory than the Latin church and all the branches which have originated in departing from its communion. At the time the Greek separated from the Latin church, immersion had no name as an ordinance among professing christians. No word which universally or even generally signified immersion, had then been used for baptism. But it is not certainly known how soon after this separation, immersion was introduced into the Greek church for baptism. It is probable however that, at first, the washing which, at that time and long before, often preceded baptism, was at length occasionally substituted for that ordinance. In this way, immersion for baptism, might have been gradually introduced(*b*). But this church, with all its superstitious foibles, does not maintain that immersion is the only mode of baptism(*c*). And, for more than a thousand years after the birth of Christ, its members had not used (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω or) any word for baptism which generally signified immerse. But whether this immersion, frequently practiced by the Greek church, or that of the Petrobrussians, is the most ancient, is not easily determined; nor is this a matter of any importance in reference to the argument. It is certain that with the one, if it existed at all, it did not originate before the year 1110; nor with the other, before the year 1050. They both had their origin in the dark ages; and neither of them did or does hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

3. *Immersion, as the only mode of baptism, was first taught during the progress of the Reformation from Popery.* This

(*a*) See Sket. of Sec. No. 3. (*b*) See Buck; Reli. Cer. and Cus. Mosheim, Wells, Wharey, Gregory and Hawies' Ch. Hist. King's Rites and Cer. of Gr. Ch. Russ. Cat. Secret Memoirs of the Court of Petersburgh; Tooke's Hist of Rus; Ricaut on the Gr. Ch.; Brit. Ency. (*c*) P. ii, Ch. 3, § 1, P. ii, Ch. 4, § 1.

reformation commenced about the year 1517. About the year 1521, the Anabaptists(*a*) began to preach and organize themselves in Saxony and in some other parts of the German Confederation. They professed to be inspired, rejected civil magistracy, the baptism of infants, and all distinctions among men. They held to polygamy, the immediate and personal appearance of Christ on earth, the immersion of adults, and a number of other peculiarities. In many respects they were grossly immoral. One of their leaders married fourteen wives, most if not all of them living at the same time. During the year 1525, their number being not less than seventy-five thousand, they took up arms and declared war against all law. They were, by the civil power, overcome and dispersed, June 24th, 1535. They remained in this disorganized state, till 1536. At this date, Menno Simon, a notoriously profligate priest, resigned his office in the Romish church, laid aside some of his immoralities, and joined the Anabaptists. Being a man of some learning and observation, he reduced their system to a degree of order. He omitted several of its most extravagant and fanciful parts. He also added some things less inconsistent with morality than their previous notions were. Under him, they adopted the notion that immersion is, not only baptism, but the only mode of baptism. This they did about the year 1538. About the same time a number of English Anabaptists renounced their baptism, sent one of their party to Amsterdam to be immersed by a Dutch Anabaptist, was immersed by him, and adopted the opinion that immersion and that only is baptism. This was the origin of immersion as the only mode of baptism. This notion originated in blood and rapine, and unbridled licentiousness. All this, its originators practiced to a fearful extent. They originated and organized their own system ; were self-appointed ; their every society is and has been self-constituted. To those who commenced the system, common morality was a stranger. In many places, the followers of these ancient immersers imitate the example of their former leaders, as nearly as circumstances will permit(*b*). Thus immersion, as

(*a*) The word Anabaptist denotes one who baptizes a second time, or a baptizer anew. Wells', Wharey's, &c., Hist. (*b*) See Ecclesiastical History, as Marsh, Mosheim, &c.; Robertson's Hist. of Charles V.; Brit. Ency.; Reli. Cer. and Cus.

the only mode of baptism, originated early in the sixteenth century, among a set of extravagantly wicked fanatics. Their horrid profligacy would make the most abandoned wretch of modern days, ashamed of their company. Their fanaticism would outdo any thing of the kind that has disgraced human nature, since they, under the name of religion, gave a loose rein to all the baser passions of the carnal heart. Let those who adopt such a system, look at its origin and blush. Let them feel that honest men instead of adopting such a system, ought to hold it in abhorrence.

4. *Immersion originated in America in the seventeenth century.* Early in this century, a minister of a congregational church in Boston(*a*), refused to commune with those who had communed with the Episcopal church. He taught that magistrates ought not to punish men for breaking the Sabbath or for disturbing public worship, and that all religions should be tolerated(*b*). These opinions produced great commotions in the commonwealth. They were contrary to the civil law. He was therefore, for teaching them, banished, about the year 1635. He settled in Providence, Rhode Island, renounced his baptism, and in March, 1638, was immersed by Mr. Ezekiel Hollyman. This Mr. Hollyman was a layman. He was not, and did not profess to be, a minister of any denomination. This layman immersed the Rev. Roger Williams, and then the Rev. Roger Williams turned round and immersed the same Mr. Hollyman and nine other persons. A minister, after preaching several years, professes to have just discovered, one of the first "principles of the doctrine of Christ."* He then admits that he had been deceiving all who had before been instructed by him on the subject of baptism. He receives immersion from a person who had no authority to administer baptism(*c*), and then fancies that this blasphemous farce authorizes him to immerse others as a substitute for baptism. Immersion in America originated therefore, in the seventeenth century, with an unimmersed layman, who, without the least shadow of authority from God's word, performed the solemn farce of immersing Roger Williams, after he, the

(a) Roger Williams. *(b)* This last is generally, and with propriety, considered to be a correct sentiment. *See Heb. 6: 1. 2. *(c)* B. i, P. vi, Ch. 2, § 1.

said Roger, had been, in profession at least, for years a minister of the gospel(*a*).

It appears therefore from this chapter, (1.) That immersion as *one mode* of baptism, or rather as a substitute for this ordinance, *may* have been practiced in France by the Petrobrussians between the years 1110 and 1150. A part of these at least, after the death of Peter De Bruys their leader, were called Henricians, after Henry one of his disciples. (2.) Some time after the year 1050, the Greek or Eastern church adopted immersion as one mode, and finally as their usual, though not as the only mode of baptizing their infants. (3.) In Germany and England, those most wicked, most horridly profligate fanatics, the Anabaptists, about the year 1538, adopted immersion as the *only mode* of baptism. This is the first instance on record of any class, society or congregation of persons, good or bad, who adopted immersion as the *only mode* of baptism. (4.) In America, immersion had its origin in the year 1638, with an unimmersed layman, who had no authority whatever to administer baptism in any mode. It is manifest therefore that, during the darkest part of the dark ages, immersion as one mode of baptism, originated in ignorance; and that, as the only mode, it had its origin in the most unblushing profligacy and licentious wickedness which could disgrace the name of man. That men professing to be intelligent christians, should adopt, as a religious ordinance, that which had such an origin, is truly astonishing. But that any such persons should seriously insist upon this progeny of licentiousness being the only mode of baptism, can only be accounted for on the supposition that they have never carefully examined the subject

CHAPTER III.

EVILS OF IMMERSION.

1. *Several evils are practiced in persuading persons to be immersed.* These are various. Only a few of them need be mentioned here. Those whom immersers are attempting to lead into their snare, are (1.) *Deceived by false statements.*

(*a*) See Sket. of Sec. No. 3.; Memoir of Roger Williams by J. D. Knowles, p. 46. 105. 106. as quoted by E. House; Marsh, Mosheim, and Church History generally.

They are told that Christ was immersed(*a*); that the Eunuch was immersed(*b*); that Christ was baptized to set us an example(*c*); that John's was the ordinance of christian baptism(*d*) that the word baptize always signifies immerse(*e*); that immersion is the only scriptural baptism(*f*); that the Lexicons and Pedobaptist writers teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism(*g*); that immersion is a christian cross(*h*); and they make a variety of other statements as destitute of truth as those here named are. (2.) By these false statements, *persons are often led to turn aside from the word of God.* They are thus induced to be immersed as a substitute for baptism; when immersion as baptism, is not so much as once mentioned in the whole scriptures(*i*). Having thus turned aside from Divine authority in relation to baptism, they (3.) Are prepared to take *the assertions of men* for their rule instead of the plain declarations of God's word(*j*). In this way they adopt the exclusive system of immersers. These are evils of no small magnitude.

2. *A number of evils are committed in the very act of receiving immersion.* (1.) The command of God is violated in which he requires men, in every religious practice to act according "to the law and to the testimony"*(*k*). As there is no precept or example in God's word for immersion; in the very act of going under the water as a part of their religion, they disobey this command. They also in this act violate all such commands as speak in this or similar language; "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man."† (2.) As in this act they trust in the directions given by man instead of those which God reveals; they may, by adopting it for baptism, draw down upon themselves that curse which is revealed in these words; "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man."‡ (3.) In this act, they use a mere human invention which originated in gross ignorance and in most wicked fanaticism(*l*) as if it was a Divine ordinance, the observance of which God had positively required, and which he had as positively forbidden to be observed in any other mode. (4.) Not a small proportion of immersers make

(*a*)See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 2, § 1. (*b*)See B. iii, P. 1, Ch. 2, § 2. (*c*)B. i, P. iii, Ch. 2, § 9. (*d*)B. i, P. iii, Ch. 1, § 18. (*e*)P. i, Ch. 1, § 7; P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. (*f*)P. i, Ch. 5, § 1-6. (*g*)P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1; P. ii, Ch. 2, § 3. (*h*)P. ii, Ch. 4, § 5. (*i*)P. i, Ch. 1, § 1-8. (*j*)P. i, Ch. 8, § 1. *Isa. 8: 20. (*k*)P. ii, Ch 3, § 5. †Ps. 146: 3. ‡Jer. 17: 5. (*l*)Ch. 2, § 3.

or at least seem to make, a saviour of immersion. As soon as they are immersed, they appear to act as if they had no other service of a religious nature to perform. They neglect secret and family prayer, turn aside from the word of God in their habitual practice, violate the Sabbath, and engage, without any apparent reluctance, in the commission of almost any popular sin. They sometimes affirm that immersion is essential to salvation; and most of them talk as if they supposed that no person could be a christian or even a moral man who refuses to be immersed(*a*). Not a small class among them, as soon as they are immersed, openly refuse to practice any religious duty(*b*). It appears therefore that they or many of them nearly or quite make a saviour of immersion.

3. *Immersion is an evil to the immersed.* By being immersed as a substitute for baptism, they are (1.) Prepared to reject or pervert every passage of scripture which speaks of the mode of baptism. As not one passage in the word of God, mentions immersion as the only mode, or even as a mode, of baptism(*c*); so they, to sustain their system, must reject or pervert every passage which mentions that subject. (2.) This cultivates prejudice against those who take the word of God for their only rule of duty. (3.) To sustain their system, they are under the necessity of making false statements as to the language of the scriptures, of Lexicons and of those who reject their notions in relation to baptism(*d*). These and many other evils, are brought upon the immersed, from adopting the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

4. *Others suffer in consequence of men adopting the opinion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.* (1.) Some have lost their lives in attempting to be immersed(*e*). In such cases, the crime of man-slaughter, if nothing worse, is committed. (2.) The health of many is destroyed or very materially injured, by being immersed. Every observing person who lives among immersers, can, no doubt, refer to

(*a*) See Bliss on Bap. (*b*) Kemmont. See also Calmet, and Bruce vol. iv, p. 275. (*c*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 8. (*d*) § 1. They frequently assert that the Bible teaches that immerson is the only mode of baptism; that the Lexicons teach the same notion; that all who believe in baptism admit their claims to be well founded, &c.; while not one of these or similar statements is true. (*e*) One instance of this kind occurred at Crewe in England Nov. 23, 1843; see Ch. In. No. 700.

instances of this evil. (3.) This opinion promotes infidelity by leading its advocates to reject the Old Testament, as if it was no part of God's word; and by frequently leading them to mistake an excitement of the imagination for true religion. (4.) Some who adopt this notion refuse the seal of God's covenant to a part of those to whom the command requires it to be applied.* (5.) Those who hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism, often put christians on a par with atheists. They debar the children of God from the table of their Saviour; because they do not adopt as the only mode of baptism, what is not mentioned as baptism in the whole of Divine revelation. They thus, as far as their principles can do so, unchurch all who will not substitute human for Divine authority in relation to the ordinance of baptism. (6.) It has a tendency to continue its advocates in ignorance, by leading them to suppose that God says one thing when he means another,—that when he says baptize, he means immerse. This same system originating, as it did, in ignorance and wickedness(*a*), introduces men who can scarcely read their mother tongue with tolerable accuracy, into that sacred office which requires all who hold it to be able to teach all things that Christ has commanded.† To place ignorance in the office of the gospel ministry, has always been, and yet is, practiced by every class of immersers (*b*). While men who have so little regard for the gospel of Christ and for the souls of our race, that they will not spend the time and labor which are necessary to qualify them in some degree for teaching what all whom the Redeemer of sinners sends out as his ambassadors must teach, are introduced into the sacred office; so long will ignorant and wicked men be found in the ministry; and so long as those who submit to the exclusive claims of immersion, admit such men to be public teachers among them; so long will their system promote ignorance and wickedness.

Thus a few of the evils of immersion, have been mentioned. These vary in their degree of guilt, from falsehood to man-slaughter. They are perpetrated by the immerser and by those who are immersed. They are either directly or indirectly countenanced by all those who adopt

*See Gen. 17: 12, Rom. 4: 11. (*a*) Ch. 2, § 3. †See Mat. 28: 19. 20. (*b*) Though this is a general truth; still there are a few men of science among their preachers.

immersion as the only mode of baptism. Christians and moral men ought to be excused from adopting such a system.

A GENERAL VIEW OF

IMMERSION AS THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM; PRESENTED IN A DIALOGUE.

BAPTIZER. Mr. immerser do you hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism?

IMMERSER. Yes, that is my belief.

B. Does God in his word, command persons to immerse or to be immersed?

I. No. He commands persons to be baptized; but says not one word concerning immersion for baptism.

B. Does God say that any person ever was immersed for baptism?

I. No. He does not. The word immerse is not once used in the whole of Divine revelation.

B. Do the scriptures teach that the word baptize always denotes immerse?

I. No. They say nothing of the kind.

B. Do they intimate that immerse is the principal signification of that word?

I. No. The bible does not inform us that the Greek word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize or (Βαπτω) its root signifies immerse.

B. Is either of the words (εμβαπτιζω or εμβαπτω) which in the Greek language, frequently denote immerse, ever used for baptize?

I. No. Neither of them is, either in the scriptures or in other books, used to denote baptism.

B. What does the word baptize mean?

I. It has a great variety of significations. Among these, it denotes to sprinkle, to wet a very small part, &c.

B. When it is said that Philip and the Eunuch "went down into the water;" is immersion taught by these words?

I. No; for if it was, then Philip must have been immersed as well as the Eunuch; because "they both went down into the water."*

B. Was the act of going into the water baptism?

I. No; because Philip baptized the Eunuch *after* they "went down into the water."

*Acts 8: 38.

B. Do the words "down into" ever mean under?

I. No. Down into the meadow does not mean under the meadow; nor down into the cellar, under the cellar, &c.

B. Do the words "up out of," signify from under?

I. No. When the Israelites came "up out of the land of Egypt,"* they did not come from under any of that country. When a man comes "up out of" the garden, he does not come from under it. When a person comes "up out of" the barn he does not come from under it.

B. Does the word baptize ever signify to put persons entirely under water and then take them up again?

I. No. Immersers never pretend that the word baptize denotes more than a very small part of what they do when they immerse persons. Indeed, it is by no means certain that the word baptize ever signifies to put a person entirely under water.

B. Did John immerse in Enon or in Jordan?

I. No. He himself declares, that when he baptized in Enon and in or at Jordan; he baptized "*with* water,"† not by putting persons under that element.

B. Is there any water at Enon sufficiently deep to immerse adults in?

I. No. Sacred Geography informs us that there is no stream in all Palestine except the Jordan, so large that in it, (except in a freshet,) an adult person could be immersed. It also informs us that at or near Enon there is no water more than a very few inches deep.

B. Why do you believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism?

I. My conscience tells me, *that* is the right way:

B. Does the word of God tell you that immersion is the only mode of baptism?

I. No. The bible tells me no such thing.

B. Then why did you adopt the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism?

I. I just made up my mind to be immersed; and then I went to the scriptures to find something to support my determination.

B. Did you find any support for your system in the word of God?

*Ex. 32: 1. †Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16; John 1: 33.

I. No; not the least. Indeed I discovered an irreconcileable opposition between my system and the word of God.

B. What did you do then?

I. Why, I determined to make such additions, alterations and amendments in the scriptures, as would make them correspond with my notions concerning immersion.

B. How did you succeed?

I. Not very well. I could find no word which really signifies what I do in immersion. Nor dare I substitute my favorite Latin word immerse for baptize in every passage where the original word or its root is used in the scriptures. If I had made this substitution in every such passage; it would have made sad work with the immersion part of my system. If I had said that Nebuchadnezzar was immersed "with the dew of heaven;" or that the Jews immersed themselves in water-pots containing less than twenty-five gallons each;* my own system must, by this language, have been cut up by the roots. But with all my anxiety to alter the word of God, so as to make it suit my notions, I did not succeed in making it say, in one passage, that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Besides, I find that my favorite words, *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*, *imbue*, *overwhelm*, and the like, do not always or generally or even at any time, express what I do in immersion. No one of these words ever denotes to put a person under water and then immediately take him up again from under its surface.

B. What will you do to escape from this difficulty?

I. I do not know. But I would rather give up the bible entirely, than forsake my long cherished, much-loved, exclusive notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

B. I thought so. You do not love immersion because it is taught, as you may fancy, in the word of God; but you love that holy book only so far as you think it teaches immersion to be the only mode of baptism. It may be well for you to lay aside this your superstitious bigotry, and hereafter take the scriptures for your only rule of duty in every religious act. See to it that you have a Divine command for every part of your religion. If you do this, you will

*See Dan. 4: 25 in Eng. and 4: 30 in Greeek, Mark 7: 4 and Luke 11: 38 in Greek, compared with John 2: 6.

soon lay aside your notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

BOOK THIRD.

SPRINKLING A MODE OF BAPTISM.

PART FIRST.

DIVINE AUTHORITY FOR SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES.

1. *That sprinkling is a mode of baptism, is expressly taught in the word of God.* The King of Zion says to his spiritual Israel in New Testament times; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you."* This prediction cannot relate to the Jewish ceremonial washings. These had been in use more than nine hundred years before this prediction was delivered by the prophet. That which was future when it was spoken by Divine authority, as was this prediction, could not refer to what had then existed nine hundred years. It must therefore refer to after ages. No new additional and permanent ordinances were, after this prediction, instituted in the Old Testament church. This must therefore refer to New Testament times. In the christian church, water is used by Divine authority, in the ordinance of baptism. God has not required, authorized or permitted, men to use water in any religious rite after the death of Christ, except in the holy ordinance of baptism. But the prophet predicts that water is, by Divine authority, to be used in New Testament times; and that it is to be sprinkled upon persons. No language can more clearly show, than this prediction does, that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. If water was used by Divine authority, in the christian church, in any other religious ordinance except baptism; then there might be a doubt as to which of these the prediction related. But since God requires water to be used in no religious ordinance except baptism; there can therefore be no doubt on the subject. The Lord expressly declares by the mouth of the

*Ezek. 36: 25.

prophet; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you." Language cannot be more explicit and positive than this. In the fulfillment of this prophecy, he will "sprinkle clean water upon" his people, either by himself or by his ministering servants; or he will sprinkle the water himself, and also authorize others to do so. But whether he sprinkles water himself, or authorizes others to do so; he, in either case, claims to be the author of the action. He is properly represented as doing that which he directs others to do. This claim he makes in the matter of baptism.* From this, it is therefore manifest, that when others, by his authority, "sprinkle clean water upon" persons in baptism, (the only ordinance in which he directs water to be used in the christian church;) he claims to be the administrator of the ordinance. (*a*). The Lord Jesus Christ does what his servants do in obedience to his command and by his authority. He therefore sprinkles clean water, when his ministering servants do so in his name and by his authority. This prediction cannot be fulfilled unless clean water is sprinkled on persons in baptism; for that is the only ordinance in which water is, in the christian church, used by Divine authority. That this sprinkling does not denote the work of the Spirit, is manifest from the language itself and from the connection in which it is found. The language is; I will "sprinkle clean water upon you." It is not; I will sprinkle you with the Spirit. It is with *water*, they are to be sprinkled. The connection teaches the same truth. The next verse says; "A new heart also will I give you."† "A new heart *also*" or *in addition* to this sprinkling, was to be given to them. The new heart which is produced by the holy Spirit in the soul at the moment of regeneration, is not therefore this sprinkling, but given in addition to it. Moreover, it is an essentially different work. It is therefore evident, as language can make it, that the expression; "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," teaches that sprinkling is a mode of baptism; and that God's spiritual Israel, the members of the New Testament church, are to be baptized by sprinkling clean water upon them.

Of the blessed Jesus, it is declared by the prophet; he

*See John 4: 1. 2. *(a)* This claim is proper, on the principle that what a person does by another, he does by himself. †See Ezek. 36: 25. 26.

shall "sprinkle many nations."* The Eunuch was reading a part of the language found in connection with this passage when he "was sitting in his chariot." From this prophetic description of Christ, Philip "preached unto him Jesus," and "baptized him."† The only passage in the whole of this portion of Isaiah's prophecy, which gives the least intimation of the use of water, is that in which it is said; he shall "sprinkle many nations." But from hearing this prophetic scripture explained, the Eunuch desired to be baptized. It appears therefore that this sprinkling mentioned by the prophet, was explained by Philip to be the application of water in baptism. Since Philip baptized the Eunuch after preaching Jesus to him from this prophetic description of the Son of God; we are clearly taught that Christ, by his servants, shall "sprinkle many nations" in baptism. As we are taught that many nations shall be sprinkled; we are not entirely without instruction as to that mode of baptism. The declaration; he shall "sprinkle many nations," contains positive evidence that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.

The Hebrew word (נזה) here used by the Spirit of God, literally signifies to "sprinkle." That part of the verb(*a*), which generally expresses causality, is, in this passage, employed by inspiration. The idea therefore when expressed in the most literal form of words possible, would be; "he shall cause many nations to be sprinkled," or "he shall cause" men "to sprinkle many nations." This is precisely the force of the words, he shall "sprinkle many nations," used in the common English translation of the bible. This same Hebrew word (נזה) is very frequently used in the Old Testament. It is used in the expressions; the priest "shall sprinkle him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times;"—"the priest—shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times;"—"he shall—sprinkle the house seven times,"‡ and in a great variety of other passages(*b*).

*Isa. 52: 15. †Acts 8: 32. 33. 35. 38. compared with Isa. 52. 13–15 and 53: 1–8 *(a)* The Hiphil conjugation. See Heb. Grammars. ‡See Lev. 14: 7. 16: 51 in Heb.

(b) This Hebrew word (נזה) also signifies to spatter, to leap for joy and to rejoice. (See Gibbs' and other Heb. Lexicons.) But it does not, (as Mr. Bliss teaches in his letters on baptism, p. 51,) denote *astonish*. It is by no means certain that this word ever has this signification. If it ever has, it is an exceedingly unusual meaning. That such a sense cannot belong to the word in Lev. 14: 7. 16. 51. is perfectly certain. No one, not even an immerser, would be willing to say, the priest—shall *astonish* of the oil with his finger seven times, &c. Mr. Bliss, in his remarks on this word, is very

The language of God's word therefore, both in the original and in the English translation of this passage, clearly and explicitly declares, that Christ, by his ministering servants, "shall," in New Testament times, "sprinkle many nations" in the administration of the holy ordinance of baptism.

2. *The word baptize signifies to sprinkle.* That the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize has a great variety of significations, is certain(*a*). When this is the fact in relation to any word, it becomes a matter of importance to be able to ascertain its exact meaning in any book or passage of a book in which it may be used. How can this be done? is an important inquiry. If the word, the exact meaning of which is sought, is a very important one, the importance of knowing its exact signification becomes proportionably great. If we would ascertain the definite meaning of any word as it is used in any book, or in any passage of the works of an author, we must not take what may possibly be its signification in one or two places, and then assert that this is the only proper meaning of the word. Such a course may pass with ignorant demagogues, with deliberate deceivers, and with those who mistake their assertions for proof. In Dictionaries or Lexicons, the usual meanings of a word are generally found. But to ascertain the exact meaning of a word in any particular passage of any book, one or both of two ways may be adopted. One is from the connection. This may be such that but one meaning will make sense in the passage. In that case the connection must determine what meaning is to be attached to the word. Another mode by which the exact signification of a word may be determined, is, by having it

(*a*) B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1; B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 4.

careful to omit *sprinkle*, though this is its radical meaning. His liberal charge of "gross perversion" made against the translators of the Bible, because they gave the radical and usual meaning to this word in the English of Isa. 52: 15, may possibly rest upon himself, unless the monomania with which he intimates he was troubled for more than 40 years, may be offered as an apology for him. (See pp. 64, 77, of his book.) To show that he is not absolutely free from the crime which he charges so frequently upon others, one out of the multitude of false assertions which he makes, will be here mentioned. He affirms (on p. 71,) that "Matthew Henry" and others whom he names, "agree" that the jailer's family "were all converted." Henry (on Acts 16: 25–34, see Vol. vi, p. 169, [par. 3.] Phil. Ed. 1838,) says the exact contrary. His language used as if addressed to the jailer, is; "Those of thy house that are infants, shall be admitted into the visible church with thee," &c. Mr. Bliss perhaps referred to the Baptist edition of Henry's Exposition, in which immersers have made a number of alterations. Men who can alter the word of God to make it suit their system, will not hesitate to alter the writings of man for the same unholy, unscriptural purpose. If persons will alter the Bible in order to sustain immersion, they will do almost any thing else for the same purpose.

defined or described by the author who uses it. In this last way, the exact meaning of a word, as used by any good writer, can always and certainly be ascertained. If the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize is thus defined and described in Divine revelation, then its exact scriptural meaning can be certainly known. In relation to the exact scriptural signification of this Greek word (βαπτιζω) it may be remarked, (1.) That it does not, from the connection in which it is used in any passage of God's word, necessarily denote any one thing which is done in immersion(*a*). This will be evident to any one who reads with care those passages which mention baptism with water.* (2.) It is frequently so used that it cannot possibly signify any part of what is done in immersion. (*b*). Those passages of scripture which mention baptism without water clearly teach this truth.† (3.) It is frequently so used that sprinkling and nothing else, will make sense in the passage(*c*)‡. (4.) To sprinkle is one legitimate meaning of this word(*d*), as given in the Lexicons. (5.) The root (βαπτω) from which it is derived, signifies to sprinkle (*d*)§. This the Lexicons also teach. (6.) In every passage of scripture in which baptism with water is required or mentioned,‖ sprinkling may be or may have been the mode. (7.) When God in his word expressly mentions the mode of baptism, he calls it sprinkling(*e*). Of this ordinance the King of Zion has said to his people in New Testament times; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you;" and again, it is declared of him, "he shall sprinkle many nations."¶ Here Omniscience defines baptism to be the sprinkling of clean water upon his spiritual Israel. (8.) The mode of baptism is often described in the scriptures of truth. In these descriptions it is called sprinkling. The Old Testament ceremonial washings are collectively denominated "divers washings" (Βαπτισμοις) or baptisms.** In the original Greek these washings are expressly called baptisms. The mode in which water and other fluids was applied in these washings or baptisms, is repeatedly mentioned in the

(a) See B. i, P. vii, Ch. 1, § 4, B. ii, P. i, Ch. 4, § 7. 8. *See Mat. 3: 11, Mark 1: 8, Luke 3: 16, John 1: 26. 33. *(b)* B. i, P. v, Ch. 1. 2. and 3, and B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 1–16. †See Mat. 20: 22, Luke 12: 50. *(c)* See Ch. 2, § 3–5. ‡See 1 Cor. 10: 1. 2. compared with Ex. 14: 21. 22. *(d)* § 4, and B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. §See Dan. 4: 30: Lev. 14: 6. 51, Luke 16: 24, all in Greek. ‖See Mat. 3: 6. 11. 13. 14. 16, Acts 8: 38 and 9: 18. &c. *(e)* § 1. ¶Ezek. 36: 25, Isa. 52: 15. **Heb. 9: 10 in Greek.

word of God. This mode is definitely and expressly, and frequently called sprinkling(*a*). In three different places in this same chapter in which these "divers washings" or baptisms are mentioned, the mode in which substances were applied in these baptisms, is expressly said to have been by sprinkling. Of the mode by which these baptisms were administered, it is expressly stated that "the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of a heifer" were used in "sprinkling the unclean." This washing or baptism is positively said to have been by sprinkling. It is stated again, that "Moses—took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." This is another of those "divers washings" (βαπτισμοις) or baptisms, which was certainly performed by sprinkling. Moreover, it is said that Moses "sprinkled"—with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry."* This washing or baptism is also positively declared to have been performed by sprinkling. Three of these "divers washings" or (βαπτισμοις) baptisms, are here mentioned. The mode of the baptism is mentioned in each case, and that mode is expressly called sprinkling. God, in these and in many other passages of scripture(*b*), describes the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize. He thus shows that when he uses it he intends to give it a definite signification. He informs us also what that signification is. He tells us positively that when he uses this word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, it means to sprinkle. Thus we are expressly taught both by Divine and human wisdom, and in a great variety of ways, that the word baptize signifies to sprinkle(*c*).

(a) § 3. *Heb. 9: 13. 19. 21. *(b)* See passages quoted in § 3.

(c) The history of the word baptize deserve here a passing remark. This word (βαπτιζω) is used by Homer, the earliest Greek writer, (See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 2, *(note b,)* and § 4.) It is used in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament which was made about 283 years before Christ. (See § 3.) Nearly 200 years before the birth of our Saviour, it is found in the Apocrypha, (See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1.) In its various modifications, it is employed ninety-three times in the New Testament, (See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 1, § 8.) It is frequently used by Josephus. He wrote soon after the Romans destroyed Jerusalem. This event took place in A. D. 70. Many classical heathen writers among the Greeks, besides Homer, use this word, (See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 4.) By the early christians who wrote in Greek, it is often employed. Soon after Greece was conquered by the Romans, about 160 years before Christ, it was introduced into the Latin language. The early christians who wrote in Latin, often used this word by merely substituting the Roman for the Greek letters. Jerome, about the year 390, used it in his Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called "The Vulgate." It became a part of the English language, almost in its first origin. The present translation of the Bible into English, was completed in 1610, and published the next year.

3. *Sprinkling is the only mode of baptism definitely mentioned in the word of God.* Baptism is often mentioned in the scriptures when the mode is not stated. It is also frequently mentioned in such connections as to render it impossible for the word to denote the application of water in any mode(*a*). But in every passage of scripture where the mode of baptism is explicitly mentioned, sprinkling is spoken of as that mode. The Old Testament ceremonial washings are collectively called (βαπτισμοις) baptisms.* Each of these is therefore one baptism. Whenever, in the whole of Divine revelation, the mode of any one or more of these washings or baptisms, is definitely mentioned, sprinkling is

(a) See B. i, P. v, Chs. 1. 2 and 3. *Heb. 9: 10 in Greek.

But for several centuries before this, the word baptize formed a part of our language. It has done so ever since. It may indeed be said that the English language is a compound made up of several others. In it, as component parts, are found a greater or less number of words which have been transferred from more than twenty different languages, ancient and modern. As examples of such transferred words, *immerse* from the low Latin, *hymn* from the Greek, *cherub* and *seraph* from the Hebrew, *dernier* from the French, &c., may be mentioned. Before the year 1610, ten or twelve translations of the scriptures and portions of the scriptures into English had been made. Wickliff completed his translation in the year 1382. Copies of it are now found in some few libraries. Tyndal completed his in 1530; another was published in 1541; another in 1549; another in 1551; and others at other dates. A few copies of these are yet extant in some large libraries. In all these, as far as known, the word baptize is used. This word (βαπτιζω) has been in use among the best Greek writers for more than 2500 years. It is now, and has for hundreds of years, been a component part of the English language. Its use is therefore as legitimate and proper as that of any other word in our language.

Immersers used the present English translation of the scriptures for more than 200 years after it was first published in 1611. During all this time, they sanctioned the use of the word *baptize* which it contained. They were so decidedly in favor of this word that they even adopted it as a denominational name. From this very word, they called themselves Baptists. Thus, for more than 200 years, they have done all they possibly could, to establish the claims of this word to be a part of the English language. By the course they have pursued all this time, they have taught that it was the most proper English term by which to express the idea contained in the Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize. Now, and for a few years past, these same Baptists, yet wearing this word for a name, represent the use of it in the English New Testament, as a "heaven-daring crime," (See Bliss on Baptism.) Let it be remembered too, that this very word (βαπτιζω) is one which the Spirit of God uses in revealing to us his will. Moreover, it has been employed for more than 200 years by this same denomination of people to express this christian ordinance. But now, to use it thus, they intimate, is a "heaven-daring crime." When for more than 200 years, they used the Bible which contains this word, (and not a few of them do so still;) were, and are they deceiving their followers? or are they deceiving them now by saying so many hard things against the present use of the word baptize in the New Testament? If immerser preachers have, as they affirm in their present declarations against the English Bible, been palming a false translation of the scriptures upon their followers for more than 200 years, in the shape of what they, with contemptuous blasphemy, often call King James' Bible; if not a few of them yet use it in their pulpits, as is notoriously the fact; then it is truly high time for the public to be on their guard against them. If they have, for more than 200 years, been thus deceiving those who have been receiving them as the Lord's messengers, whether this deception has been from ignorance or design; it is certainly proper they should now be carefully watched.

the mode expressly named. These "washings" or baptisms are said to be administered by sprinkling in a great variety of passages of scripture. But, in no instance, is any other mode of performing these "washings" or baptisms, expressly stated. The mode of baptism is either not explicitly mentioned, or in some form of words it is denominated sprinkling. When the terms wash or purify or the like, are used, they do not describe the mode. They merely teach the fact that a washing or baptism was administered in some mode, without specifying what that was. In more than twenty instances in the passages referred to,* these baptisms are expressly said to be by sprinkling. In these passages, water and blood are often said to be sprinkled on persons in performing those ceremonial washings which God, by his servant calls (βαπτισμοις) baptisms.† These baptismal washings by sprinkling, are mentioned in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Only a part of them have been referred to. But in every passage in which the mode of these baptisms is expressly mentioned, it is, in some form of words, denominated sprinkling; and in no instance is it, in any form of language, expressly said to be by immersion.

The Hebrew word (טבל) usually translated into Greek by (Βαπτω) the root of that for baptize, is, in one passage in the Septuagint(*a*) rendered by (Βαπτιζω) baptize itself. The passage is this; Naaman—"went down and (εβαπτισατο) "dipped" or baptized "himself seven times in" (εν) "Jordan" or with its waters.‡ That the Hebrew word here translated into Greek by (Βαπτιζω) baptize and into English by dip, does not indicate the mode by which water was applied in the case of this captain of the Syrian army, is manifest from several considerations. (1.) The word (רחצ) used by the prophet in his direction to Naaman, does not express mode. It expresses what is done; not the mode by which the act is performed. Elisha directed him to wash in or with the waters of the Jordan. (2.) He understood what

*See Lev. 4: 6. 17 and 5: 9 and 7: 2 and 8: 11. 19. 24. 30 and 9: 12. 18 and 14: 7. 27. 51 and 16: 14. 15. 19, Num. 8: 7 and 19: 4. 13. 18–21, Heb. 9: 13. 19. 21 and 11: 28. †Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. *(a)* The Septuagint, or the Seventy, is the translation of the Hebrew of the Old Testament into the Greek language. It is so called, because about seventy Greek scholars are supposed to have been engaged in the work. It was made about the year 283 before the birth of Christ. Septuagint is a modified Latin word for seventy. ‡See 2 (called in Greek 4) Kings, 5: 10. 12. 13. 14 in Hebrew, Greek and in English.

the prophet said. This is certain; because he says;—"may I not" (רחצ) "wash in" the rivers of Damascus "and be clean." (3.) His servants also understood the prophet's directions; for they used the same word, when they urged him to "wash and be clean." Here the word wash which does not express mode, is three times used in reference to this transaction. There is no probability therefore that (טבל) the other word used in relation to the same transaction, differs materially in its signification from these three. But if this last word does express mode, it denotes to sprinkle. This is manifest (1.) From the fact that this Hebrew word often signifies to wet a small part, to sprinkle and the like(a). It appears (2.) From the fact that the law required the leper, in his ceremonial washings, to be sprinkled seven times.* (3.) Only a small part of his body was leprous. This we learn from the intimation given that he was capable of attending to the laborious business of a Syrian commander.† This he could not have done; if any considerable portion of his body had been infected with that most loathsome and distressing disease, the leprosy. His language in relation to what he supposed Elisha would have done, teaches the same. fact. He said; "I thought, he will—strike his hand over the place and recover the leper."‡ This language teaches that only one place or a small proportion of his body, was leprous. This part was what needed a cure; this part therefore and this only, needed to have the remedy applied to it. Naaman desired to have this diseased "place" cured. To this the attention of Elisha was directed. To this the water must be applied in order to effect a cure. It was this therefore, the prophet directed to be washed. He must perform this washing himself. It appears then that he, as a leper to be cleansed, had to wash, by sprinkling, the part diseased, in order that a cure might be effected. If therefore the mode of Naaman's washing is intimated by the use of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, the intimation is that it was by sprinkling.

The word (בצת) which signifies to frighten, is in the Septuagint, once translated into Greek by the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize.§ In English it is translated frighten;

(a) B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 7; B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 4. *See Lev. 14: 7. †2 Kings 5:1-18. ‡2 Kings 5: 11. §See Isa. 21: 4 in Heb. Gr. and Eng.

"fearfulness affrighted me." The mode by which the fear is produced is not mentioned here. The fact that it *is produced*, not the mode by which the person is affrighted, is taught in the passage. It will appear evident therefore to any one who will carefully examine this subject that the use of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize in the Septuagint forms no exception to the proposition that sprinkling is the only mode of baptism definitely mentioned in the word of God.

4. *The root* (βαπτω) *from which the word* (βαπτιζω) *for baptize, is derived, signifies to sprinkle.* This is one meaning of the Greek word(*a*). It is seldom used in the New Testament(*b*). In one passage it denotes to wet the end of the finger. This is truly a very small part of the whole body. The rich man in torment, asks that Lazarus "may dip" (βαψη) "the tip of his finger in water and cool" his "tongue."* This word cannot here signify more than to wet an exceedingly small part of the whole person. In another passage it is difficult to determine its exact import. It is the one in which our Saviour points out the person of his betrayer. He declared that he to whom he gave "a sop" or small piece "when" he had (βαψας) "dipped it,"† would betray him. Whether this word (βαψας) denotes *to take* up, *break off*, *take from a dish*, or *out of a liquid* or *to wet* a small part or the whole of the sop, is not easily determined. But when it was dipped; he gave it to Judas. The other text in which this word (βαπτω) is found, is used in describing the Captain of Salvation as a conquerer returning victorious from the field of battle, with his "vesture" (βεβαμμενον) "dipped in blood."‡ The mode in which the warrior's garments are stained with or dipped in blood, is, (not by taking them off and immersing them in the purple fluid, but) by the blood gushing out upon them from the wounded adversary or fallen foe. This word therefore in the New Testament, signifies to wet a very small part of the person; and to stain the vesture by sprinkling it profusely with blood.

In the Septuagint(*c*), the word (βαπτω) is used fourteen times to express the signification of the Hebrew term(טָבַל) which is translated into English by the words "*dip*" or "*dip-*

(*a*)See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. (*b*)Only three times. *Luke 16: 24 in Greek. †John 13: 26 in Greek. ‡Rev. 19: 13 in Greek. (*c*)The O. T. in Greek.

ped;"—"*plunge* in the ditch;"—and "*wet*" with dew.* This same Greek word also denotes to *wash*, *sprinkle*, *tinge*, and the like(*a*). This Hebrew word (טָבַל) is once translated into Greek by a term (μολυνω) which signifies to *defile*, *pollute*, *disgrace*, *dye*, *stain* or *tinge*. In the passage where it is used; it is translated by the word *dip*. Joseph's brethren (εμολυναν) "dipped" "his coat in the blood" of the kid which they had killed.† Their design was to make their father believe that Joseph had been killed by some ravenous beast. To do this they must stain his coat with blood. The mode of doing this to produce the deception, must be similar to that by which the garment of a person who had been killed by a wild beast, would be stained. This would be by the blood of the person killed by the animal, flowing out upon his clothes. His coat, in this way, would be partly stained with blood; not entirely immersed in it. The Greek word (βαπτω) from which that for baptize is derived, is, in some passages, used to express an exceedingly gentle sprinkling. To be "wet with the dew of heaven," is to be sprinkled with very small drops. Every one knows that dew falls in drops almost imperceptibly minute. The word therefore which expresses the mode by which a person is wet with dew, must denote a very gentle sprinkling. This is (βαπτω) the root from which the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize is derived.‡ The same word is used to denote the wetting of a very small part of what is mentioned. In the ceremonial purification of a leper who had been "healed;" the priest was required to command to be taken "for him that" was "to be cleansed, two birds alive and clean, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop;" and when one of the birds was killed, it is said; he "shall" (βαψει) "dip" all these "in the blood of the bird that was killed."§ Now, nothing can be more manifest than the fact that but a very small part of the living bird, the wood, scarlet and hyssop, could be wet when they were all dipped in the blood of the dead bird. To suppose that these were put entirely under the blood of the bird which had been slain, would be absurd. A bird of any species is an animal

*See Ex. 12: 22, Lev. 4: 6 and 9: 9, and 14: 6. 51, Num. 19: 18, Deut. 33: 24, Josh. 3: 15, Ruth 2: 14, 1 Sam. (Gr. 1 Kings) 14: 27, 2 Kings (Gr. 4 Kings) 8: 15, Job 9: 31, Dan. 4: 33, Heb. and Gr. 4: 30 and 5: 21, in Heb. Gr. and Eng. (*a*)See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. †Gen. 37: 31 in Heb. Gr. and Eng. ‡See Dan. 4: 33 (Gr. 4: 30) in Greek and English. §See Lev. 14: 2–6. 51 in Gr and Eng.

which, for its size, has very little blood. It would be impossible to immerse any one "clean bird" in the blood of any other, and much less all the articles here mentioned. The same word is used where it is said; thou shalt "plunge" (εβαψας) "me in the ditch."* When a person is plunged in the ditch, he is not put all over under water; he is only besmeared with mud or filth of some kind. In the Septuagint therefore this word (βαπτω) from which baptize is derived, denotes (1.) To wet a very small part; (2.) To sprinkle with dew; (3.) To besmear with mud or filth. This root therefore denotes to sprinkle. As the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, being derived from it, cannot signify more than its root(*a*); so baptize must signify the most gentle sprinkling of which a conception can be formed; because the sprinkling which it expresses, is or may be more gentle than that of the falling dew. As the root of the word for baptize denotes to wet a very small part; so the word itself must signify to wet as small if not a smaller portion of what is baptized. From the passages here quoted, it is undeniably certain that the root (βαπτω) from which the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, is derived, signifies to *sprinkle* in an exceedingly gentle manner.

5. *The Hebrew word* (טבל) *which, in the Septuagint, is translated by* (βαπτω) *the root from which baptize is derived, signifies to sprinkle.* This Hebrew word often denotes a ceremonial washing; while another (רחצ) more frequently indicates a literal cleansing. The dew falls in very small drops. They are so minute as to be sometimes almost or quite imperceptible to the senses. The word therefore which denotes to wet with dew must signify to sprinkle with small drops. This Hebrew word (טבל) is used when it is said of Nebuchadnezzar; "his body was wet with the dew of heaven."† It is certain therefore that it means to sprinkle; because it is used to indicate a wetting with dew; and this can only take place by an exceedingly gentle sprinkling. This same Hebrew word is used to express the wetting of a very small part of the bird, cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop,‡ mentioned in the cleansing of the leper. This Hebrew word

*Job 9: 31 in Gr. and Eng. (*a*) See P. ii, Ch. 1, § 2. †Dan. 4: 30 in Heb. and 33 in Eng. ‡See Lev. 14: 6. 51 in Heb. and Eng.

therefore, since it denotes to *wet* with dew must signify to sprinkle.

6. *What is signified by christian baptism, is denominated sprinkling.* When, in the scriptures, what is signified by baptism, is, at any time so mentioned as to indicate the mode of the Spirit's influence; it is expressly called sprinkling, or other words which signify to sprinkle are employed. This will be evident by a few examples, (1.) To denote the work of the Spirit in regeneration; it is said "our hearts" are "sprinkled from an evil conscience."* (2.) To express the application of the blood of Christ to the soul at conversion, by the power of the Holy Ghost; it is called "the blood of sprinkling;" and the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."† (3.) The various operations of the Spirit which are, or may be, denominated, baptism with the Holy Ghost, are expressed by words which indicate sprinkling. The Holy Spirit, in his operations upon the souls of men, is said to *drop* as rain or dew or showers; to be *poured* out upon them, as rain from a cloud or as tears from the eye; to *be given;* to *descend;* to be *shed;* to *come* and to *fall* upon them.‡ These words all indicate sprinkling. To pour out water as from a cloud upon the earth, is to sprinkle it profusely; to fall as the rain or dew or as a shower is to fall in drops or to sprinkle; to be shed down, is to fall or be poured down like a heavy shower. These expressions therefore, so repeatedly made, show that spiritual baptism or the work of the Holy Ghost, being that which is signified in christian baptism(*a*), is expressed by sprinkling. Literal sprinkling in baptism is a proper external symbol or sign of this internal spiritual sprinkling or baptism with the Holy Ghost. It is clear therefore that the ordinance of christian baptism, which is the sign of spiritual sprinkling, must, or at least may be, administered by sprinkling. Between internal and external sprinkling, there is an exact resemblance. They are both by sprinkling. But immersion cannot be a sign of spiritual sprinkling; because there is not the least similitude between sprinkling the blood of Christ, or the falling of the Spirit on the soul, and the entire submer-

*Heb. 10: 22. †Heb. 12: 24, 1 Pet 1: 2. ‡Deut. 32: 2 and 33: 28, Ps. 72: 6, Hos. 10: 12 and 14: 5, Mic. 5: 7, Ps. 77: 17, Prov. 1: 23, Isa. 32: 15 and 44: 3, Joel 2: 28, John 1: 32, Acts 2: 4. 17 and 4: 8. 31, and 10: 44. 45 and 11: 15, Rom. 5: 5, Tit. 3: 6. (*a*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9.

sion of the body in water. Literal immersion cannot be a sign to symbolize or represent spiritual sprinkling; while this symbolical representation is manifest in literally sprinkling clean water upon the person.

Besides, baptism is a sacrament(*a*). In the sacrament the resemblance between the sign and the thing signified, ought to be as exact as possible. That which is signified in christian baptism, is expressed by sprinkling; the sign therefore to secure a resemblance, must be by sprinkling. The work of the Spirit, which is signified in this ordinance, is spiritually pure; therefore to resemble this, clean or pure water, ought to be used in administering the ordinance of christian baptism.

7. *The scriptural mode of performing ceremonial washings, is by sprinkling.* The *mode* of performing these, is not always mentioned in the word of God. But when it is mentioned, it is always represented as being performed by sprinkling. Either the word sprinkle is used or other terms which signify to sprinkle. In no case is any one scriptural ceremonial washing said to be performed by immersion*(*b*). *The material used in these purifications, is said to be sprinkled*, whenever the mode is mentioned. The "blood" used in these, was sprinkled :† The "water" was sprinkled :‡ "Ashes" were sprinkled:§ Oil was sprinkled:‖ *Persons were sprinkled.* The priests and Levites and all the "people" are said to have been sprinkled.¶ *Things were sprinkled;* such as the "altar," the "horns of the altar," the "tabernacle," the "book," houses, the "vessels of the ministry," the "tent," the "mercy-seat," before "the mercy-seat,"** &c. Words which do not express mode, such as wash, cleanse, and the like, are occasionally used to denote ceremonial purifications. But in every instance where their mode is expressed, it is, in some form of words, uniformly denominated sprinkling. Christian baptism is a ceremonial washing. It is the only one to be used in New Testament times. The command in relation to this washing includes succession. The directions for other washings do not. The washing of

(*a*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1 § 10. *See Heb. 9: 10. 13. 19. 21 and 11: 28 in Greek, Luke 11: 38 in Greek, Lev. 4: 6. 17 and 5: 9, Num. 8: 7, &c. (*b*)§ 3. †See Lev. 7: 2 and 8: 19. 24, Heb. 9: 19. 21 and 11: 28. ‡See Num 8: 7, Heb. 9: 19. §See Heb. 9: 13: ‖See Lev. 8: 11 and 14: 16. 27. ¶Num. 8: 7 and 19: 18, Heb. 9: 19. **Ex. 24: 6, Lev. 14: 51. 52, and 16: 14. 15. 19, Heb. 9: 19. 21.

the disciple's feet*(*a*) was under the Old Testament dispensation, and the direction on that subject did not include succession. Baptism is not a washing for cleanliness. It is not administered for the putting away of the filth of the flesh."† It is not therefore a literal washing the design of which is to cleanse a part or the whole of the person. It does not, and cannot purify the soul(*b*). It is not therefore a spiritual washing which removes sinful pollution from the person. It must then be a ceremonial washing of those who are baptized. In such purifications, when a part is washed, the individual is "clean every whit."‡ This baptismal ceremonial washing is an external sign of the work of the Spirit on the soul(*c*). It is a scriptural washing(*d*). But as scriptural ceremonial washings, whenever the mode is mentioned, are represented, as being by sprinkling; so baptism, as it is a scriptural ceremonial washing, must or at least may, be properly performed by sprinkling.

8. *Sprinkling is a baptismal seal.* Christian baptism is a seal(*e*). As such it can only be applied to a part of what is sealed. To cover with the sealing material, the whole of what is intended to be sealed, does not confirm but destroys its validity(*f*). The size of a seal does not render it more or less valid, if it is not so large as to destroy its nature as a seal. The seal which is a quarter of an inch in diameter confirms as thoroughly what is sealed, as that would do which covered a thousand times greater surface. The least quantity of the sealing material, will confirm as really and be as valid, as if the quantity was increased. The least quantity therefore of water, the sealing material in baptism, applied to the smallest surface on or near the proper place, by a minister of Christ, in the name of the Trinity, is a baptismal seal equally valid with a larger quantity; if the quantity is not so large as to destroy the nature of a seal. For not too small, but too large a quantity of the sealing material, destroys the nature of a seal and renders it invalid.

The baptismal seal is to be applied to the forehead. The servants of God are to be "sealed," and to be "sealed" in "their foreheads."§ The name of God is thus "written"

*See John 13: 5. 8. 10. 14. (*a*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch: 1, § 5. †1 Pet. 3: 21. (*b*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 16. ‡John 13: 10. (*c*)See B, i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. (*d*)See B. i, P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–4. (*e*)See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11. (*f*)See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 10. §See Song 4: 12, Ezek. 9: 4, 2 Cor. 1: 22, Eph. 1: 13, Rev. 7: 3 and 9: 4.

or stamped on "their foreheads."* That baptism therefore which is a seal, must be a quantity of water, the sealing material, no matter how small, applied to the forehead of the person baptized or sealed. Water sprinkled on the forehead is therefore a proper baptismal seal; or sprinkling water upon the forehead of a person in the name of the Triune God, is christian baptism.

9. *Sprinkling is the only mode of baptism, that can be universally administered.* This holy ordinance is to be administered in all climates, and in all seasons of the year, and to persons in every stage of any disease(*a*). The commission to baptize includes all this. The Lord Jesus Christ directs his ministering servants to "Go—and teach all nations, baptizing them;" and to "preach the gospel to every creature."† These directions show that the gospel is to be preached in every nation; and that persons in every condition in life are to be baptized, in the different nations of the earth. On this point, it may be remarked, (1.) That baptism by sprinkling can be administered in any climate. Wherever human beings can live, they can, at any season of the year, be baptized by sprinkling. This is self evident. (2.) In any disease, this mode of baptism may be adopted. It is perfectly evident that any person in any stage of any disease, will not suffer by being baptized by sprinkling. Neither the burning heat of the torid zone, nor the insupportable cold of the frigid; neither the ravages of disease, nor the thirsty, unwatered desert, can render sprinkling, as a mode of baptism, either impossible or improbable. Baptism may be thus administered with equal ease in the parched desert, in the frozen north and in the temperate plain. (3.) In all places where baptism is said to have been administered; sprinkling may have been the mode. John might have baptized by sprinkling in or at "Jordan","—"in Enon"—"in Bethabara beyond Jordan,"—or "in the wilderness."‡ The "three thousand,"—the "men and women,"—"Simon,"—"the Eunuch," —"Cornelius—and—his friends,"—"Lydia,"—"the Jailer," —"Paul" while standing,—"Crispus and Gaius,"—and the "household of Stephanus,"§ may have

*Rev. 14: 1. (*a*)See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 1. †Mat. 28: 19, Mark 16: 15. ‡Mat. 3: 6, Mark 1: 4. 6, John 1: 28 and 3: 23 and 10: 40. §Acts 2: 41 and 8: 12. 13. 38 and 10: 24. 48 and 16: 14. 15. 33 and 22: 16, 1 Cor. 1: 14. 16.

been baptized by sprinkling. (4.) The commission given by our Saviour to his ambassadors to baptize, requires the ordinance to be administered in all climates, at all seasons, in all places and in all diseases. Sprinkling and that only can be made thus universal. That mode and that only can possibly be administered in some places where Jesus Christ commands baptism to be administered. That only can be safely or innocently practiced during the progress of some diseases. Even pouring for baptism, in some climates, would be impossible ; and in some diseases would increase the malady or produce death. As sprinkling and that only can be practiced in all places and in all cases where baptism is, by the Saviour's command, to be administered ; so that must be *a mode*, if not *the only mode* of administering that ordinance. If sprinkling is not a mode of baptism ; then that ordinance cannot be administered when and where and to whom, the Lord Jesus Christ teaches in the commission, it is to be and will be administered. It is the only mode in fact that can become co-extensive with the commission to administer this ordinance. It must therefore be a mode, if not the only mode of baptism.

10. *That with which baptism is administered, descends upon the baptized.* A few instances will show this fact. (1.) When Nebuchadnezzar was "wet" (εβαφη) or baptized "with the dew of heaven ;"* the small drops of dew descended upon him. (2.) When the Israelites were baptized in (εν) or with "the sea;" the spray of the sea must have descended upon them. They were not immersed or put entirely under water(*a*). While in "the midst of the sea ;" they were on "dry ground."† The water then could not be poured on them out of vessels ; and if it had been, it would have descended upon them. While the Israelites were walking on dry ground, through the opening made in the sea by Divine power; it was impossible for them to be baptized in any mode without the water descending upon them. Had they been immersed as the Egyptians were; the water must have come down upon them. In "the midst of the sea," they were on "dry ground." In such a situation, it was impossible to thrust them under water. But, as they were baptized while on dry ground in the opening made in the sea ; the water

*Dan. 4: 33(Gr. 30)and 5: 21 in Gr. and Eng. (*a*)B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 4. †Ex. 14: 22.

must have descended upon them in spray while they were passing through. (3.) When they were baptized in (εν) or with "the cloud;"* the drops of rain were "poured" down upon them.† (4.) Of the "divers washings" (βαπτισμοις)or baptisms, the mode of which is mentioned in the word of God, many specimens are given. These are all by sprinkling (*a*). In these therefore the water and blood which were sprinkled, descended upon what was in this way ceremonially cleansed. (5.) When persons were baptized with the Holy Ghost; he is said to descend or fall, to be poured out, to be shed, &c.‡ upon them. That therefore with which persons were baptized, descended upon them.

11. *John intimates that he baptized by sprinkling.* In speaking to his disciples of his baptism as a ceremonial washing, he says to them of Christ; "God giveth not the Spirit by measure" (εκ μετρου) or out of a measure, "to him."§ Here John appears to be contrasting his baptism with water, with that which Christ received with the Spirit in his human nature. When therefore he declares that Christ did not receive the one out of a measure; it is clearly intimated that he did receive the other from John out of a measure capable of containing water. Thus he intimates that he baptized with water out of a measure; or that he administered his baptism by sprinkling.

12. *Sprinkling as a mode of baptism, is often positively commanded in the word of God.* To sprinkle is one meaning of the word baptize(*b*). Whenever therefore a command to baptize is given, sprinkling as a mode is required, if baptism with water is intended. Because one meaning of the word baptize is to sprinkle; every passage which commands baptism with water, requires it to be administered by sprinkling as one mode. Several particular commands may here be noticed. (1.) God sent John "to baptize with water."‖ He was therefore required to administer his baptism by sprinkling; because that is one meaning of the word baptize. (2.) Christ commands his ministering servants to baptize all nations;¶ and as the word baptize denotes to sprinkle, therefore they were to administer the ordinance of christian baptism by sprinkling as a mode. (3.) The inspi-

*1Cor. 10: 2 in Greek. †Ps. 77: 17. (*a*)§ 7. ‡See Ps. 72: 6 and Acts 1: 5 compared with Acts 2: 17 and 10: 44. 45 and 11: 15. 16, &c. §John 3: 34 in Gr. (*b*)§ 2. ‖John 1: 33. ¶Mat. 28: 19.

red Peter commanded his hearers "on the day of Pentecost," to "be baptized."* (4.) Paul was directed to "be baptized."† As baptize, a word which signifies sprinkle, is used, each of these commands requires sprinkling to be practiced as one mode of baptism. These, and other instances, show conclusively that baptism with water, by sprinkling, is a commanded duty(*a*). Since sprinkling is one of the legitimate meanings of the word baptize(*b*), and since this mode may have been practiced in any place and under any circumstances in which baptism is, in the scriptures said to have been administered(*c*), this must therefore be a mode, and may be the only scriptural mode of baptism.

13. *In every passage of scripture in which baptism with water is mentioned, sprinkling, as one mode, is taught.* Baptism with water is very frequently mentioned either directly or indirectly, in the word of God. In each of these passages the word baptize which denotes to sprinkle, is used; or the word sprinkle itself‡ is employed. All those passages therefore in which the word baptize is used to express the christian ordinance of baptism, or any other baptism with water, teach that sprinkling is a mode. Whether the word baptize, which signifies to sprinkle, is used, or the word sprinkle itself; the same truth is presented to the mind. The use of either word proves conclusively, that sprinkling is a mode of baptism; because one meaning of the word baptize is to sprinkle.

CHAPTER II.

SCRIPTURAL EXAMPLES OF SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

1. *Jesus Christ was baptized by sprinkling.* He was baptized to fulfill the demands of that law which required the priests to be washed with water, before they entered on the duties of their office(*d*). He had water applied to him in order "to fulfill all righteousness."§ As to fulfill all righteousnes, is to comply, in every point, with all the demands of a righteous law; so our Saviour, in order to be legally qualified to enter publicly upon the functions of the office of

*Acts 2: 1. 38; See also 10: 48. †Acts 22: 16. (*a*) B. i, P. i, Ch. 1, § 1–4. (*b*) B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. (*c*) § 9. ‡Isa. 52: 15, Ezek. 36: 25, Heb. 9: 10. 13. 19. 21 in Greek. (*d*) See B. i, P. iii, Ch. 2, § 6. §Mat. 3: 15.

a priest, which was one part of his Mediatorial work, was washed with water. This washing of the priests, is three times mentioned in the word of God. Moses was commanded to "wash" Aaron and his sons "with water;" and he "washed them with water."* God, by his servant, expressly mentions the mode of this washing. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying; take the Levites." The word *Levites*, included the whole Tribe of Levi. Aaron and his sons were of this Tribe. What God directs to be done to the Levites, must include Aaron and his sons, as well as other members of the Tribe, unless they are excepted in some form of language. God is now about to mention the mode in which water was applied to the Levites. He said to Moses; "thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them."† Here we are expressly informed that the Levites were to be sprinkled with water when they were to be set apart to the service of God. Aaron was a "Levite."‡ His sons were therefore Levites. The Levites then included Aaron and his sons. These last were set apart as priests under the Old Testament dispensation of the covenant.§ Not the least hint is contained in the scriptures, which could lead us to suppose that the mode by which Aaron and his sons were washed, differed in any respect from that by which the other Levites were washed. The Levites were washed by sprinkling. Aaron and his sons were Levites; therefore they were washed by sprinkling. Jesus Christ had water applied to him in order to comply perfectly with that law which required water to be applied to the priests when they were about to enter publicly on the discharge of the duties of the priestly office. This law required water to be sprinkled upon them; therefore to comply perfectly with this law, Jesus Christ must have been sprinkled with water, when John, "to fulfill all righteousness," baptized him. If he was not sprinkled, then that part of the Divine command which required the "water of purifying" to be sprinkled, was not fulfilled by him. But as Christ did fulfill every part of this law as well as of all others, the water must have been sprinkled upon him, as God had directed. The righteousness of the law which he was about to fulfill in his baptism, required the water to be sprin-

*Ex. 40: 12, Lev. 8: 6. †Num. 8: 7. ‡Ex. 4: 14. §See Ex. 40: 13. 14. 15.

kled. He therefore, as he fulfilled this law at his baptism, had water sprinkled upon him as the law required: Jesus Christ was therefore baptized by sprinkling.

2. *The Ethiopian Eunuch was baptized by sprinkling.* This Eunuch was sitting in his chariot, in his journey from Jerusalem to Gaza, when the Spirit of God directed Philip to approach him. He, at the time, was reading in Isaiah's prophecy. The passage upon which his attention was fixed at that particular instant, was this; "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," &c. The Eunuch enquired of Philip, whether the prophet made this declaration "of himself" or "of some other man;" or in other words, he desired to know from Philip, who was meant by the word "he," used by the prophet in the passage he was reading. To ascertain who is intended by "he," in this passage, it is necessary to look back and examine the preceding context. When this examination takes place, it will be found, that the word "he," in the passage which the Eunuch was reading, stands for "servant," as that word is used in this expression; "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently." Then, if any one will read onward from this last passage, he will find it stated of this "servant;"—"He shall be exalted;"—He shall "sprinkle many nations;"—"He shall grow—as a root out of a dry ground;"—He "shall be despised and rejected of men;"—"He hath borne our griefs;"—"He was wounded for our transgressions;"—"The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;"—"He was oppressed;"—"He was afflicted;"—"He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." In these expressions; "he" is said to do many things; and among the rest, it is declared, "he shall sprinkle many nations." The prophet predicts the sprinkling of many nations. From this prophetic description of our Saviour's sufferings, Philip preached Christ to the Eunuch, and then baptized him as Isaiah had predicted. Isaiah in the very passage from which Philip preached, declares prophetically that many nations were to be sprinkled. One inspired man predicts the mode of baptism to be by sprinkling; another, under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, baptizes the Eunuch with this prophecy before him. One inspired man mentions the mode in which baptism is to be administered; another

administers the ordinance(*a*). As one inspired man would not act in opposition to what another had said; so it is perfectly certain that Philip baptized the Eunuch by sprinkling; because the prophet, in the very passage from which he preached, had said; he shall "sprinkle many nations."* Thus by comparing scripture with scripture, it becomes absolutely certain to those who believe what God says in his word; that the Eunuch was baptized by sprinkling. Moreover, the word baptize which signifies to sprinkle, is used of this ordinance which was administered to the Eunuch. The same word was also used of John's baptism which our Saviour received(*b*). Both were therefore baptized by sprinkling.

3. *Paul was baptized by sprinkling.* He "arose and was baptized."† If he had been baptized in any other way except by sprinkling; he would have lay, sat or kneeled down to receive the ordinance. Those who are immersed as a substitute for baptism, always lie down. Those who have water poured upon them for baptism, always kneel down or sit down. But persons never arise to receive the ordinance of baptism except when they are sprinkled. As therefore Paul "arose" to be "baptized;" so he must have been baptized by sprinkling. In his case too, the word baptize which signifies to sprinkle, is used of this ordinance. This twofold evidence, the fact that he arose and the use of a word which denotes to sprinkle, must be an unanswerable proof to the unprejudiced mind that Paul was baptized by sprinkling.

4. *Those who were baptized by John were sprinkled.* That he administered his baptism by sprinkling, is proved, (1.) From the language used. Wherever his ceremonial washing is definitely mentioned, the word baptize which denotes sprinkle, is employed. If, at any time, he had immersed for his ceremonial washing; one of the words (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) which sometimes evidently signify immerse, would have been used at least once for his baptism, when it is so frequently mentioned in the scriptures. But when the word baptize which signifies to sprinkle, but does not in the whole of Divine revelation, signify immerse(*c*), is uniformly em-

(*a*)See Ch. 1, § 1. *See Isa. 52: 13-15 and 53: 2-8 compared with Acts 8: 26-38.
(*b*)§ 1. †Acts 9: 18. (*c*)See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 1, § 7. 8, B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1 § 1, Ch. 1, § 2.

ployed to express his baptism; the evidence is clear that he baptized by sprinkling. (2.) He baptized Jesus Christ by sprinkling(*a*); therefore that was his mode of baptism. There is not the least intimation given in the account of our Saviour's baptism, which can lead persons to suppose that John adopted, in the baptism of Christ, a mode which differed in any external point from that used by him when he baptized other persons. But as he baptized Christ by sprinkling; that therefore was his mode. (3.) The number he baptized daily, proves that sprinkling was the mode he practiced(*b*). "John did no miracle;"* and without a miracle, it would be absolutely impossible for one man to baptize in any mode except that of sprinkling, the numbers to whom he applied water. John therefore baptized by sprinkling. All then baptized by him, are examples of persons baptized by sprinkling.

5. *The whole nation of Israel were baptized by sprinkling.* Their baptism took place when they were escaping from Egyptian bondage. At this time, they numbered "about six hundred thousand—men, besides" women and "children."† In this number, the Levites were not included.‡ In this enumeration, only men over twenty years of age, who were "able to go forth to war," are mentioned.§ There must have been at least as many women as men. There were therefore at that time in the nation of Israel more than twelve hundred thousand persons over twenty years of age. This number would probably be less than one third of the whole people of Israel at that time; as not more than one-third, perhaps not one-fourth part of the human race, reach the age of twenty. If there were six hundred thousand men over twenty; the same number of women; and three times as many persons under twenty as there were over that age; then there would have been thirty-six hundred thousand persons under twenty, and twelve hundred thousand above that age; or in the whole nation, excepting the tribe of Levi, there would have been forty-eight hundred thousand; and including that tribe, there could not have been less than five millions in all. But to say that at least two millions five hundred thousand individuals were included in the whole nation

(*a*) § 1. (*b*) B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 6. *John 10: 41. †Ex. 12: 37, Num 1: 1–46. ‡See Num. 1: 47. §Num. 1: 3.

of Israel when they were baptized in (εν) or with "the cloud" and in (εν) or with "the sea,"* would be to keep entirely within the bounds of certainty. The nation of Israel then including at least twenty-five hundred thousand persons, were (1.) "Baptized in" (εν) or with "the cloud." To be baptized in or with a cloud can be done only by the mist of which it is composed, resting in very small particles of water upon those who are thus baptized; or by the mist becoming condensed into larger drops and then falling upon them in rain. In either case the baptism must be by sprinkling. In one case the mist in very small particles of water falls upon the baptized; in the other, the drops which fall upon them in their baptism, are larger. The latter is usually called rain; the former mist. When "the cloud went from before" the Israelites and "stood behind them;" it "poured out water."† This water poured out from the cloud as it passed to the rear of the Israelites, must, like the rain, have fallen in drops; because this is the way in which water is invariably poured out of the clouds. There is not the least evidence that this water was poured out of the cloud in a way different from water falling from clouds at any other time. Here then, in (εν) or with this cloud, not less than twenty-five hundred thousand persons were baptized by sprinkling. (2.) These same Israelites were also all baptized in (εν) or with "the sea."* This their baptism was on "dry ground." It could not therefore possibly have been by immersion(*a*). To immerse or put persons entirely under water, while they are on "dry land,"‡ is a complete impossibility. To mention the thing is to expose its absolute absurdity. These Israelites could not have been baptized by pouring water upon them out of any vessel. There were no persons appointed to do this for them. Nor could this, in their situation, have been done for them by human beings. If the sea had closed in upon them as it did upon the Egyptians; they could not then have passed through it on "dry ground."§ Indeed, if water had been poured upon each of them in any quantity which could properly be called pouring in baptism; the ground would not have been dry in the midst of the sea where they were baptized. They could not therefore have been bapti-

*1 Cor. 10: 2 in Greek. †Ex. 14: 19, Ps. 77: 17. (*a*) B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7; § 4. ‡Ex. 14 21. 29. §Heb. 11: 29.

zed on "dry ground," in any mode except by sprinkling. To have baptized them in any other way, would have wet the ground. When therefore they were baptized "on dry ground in the midst of the sea," the mode must have been by sprinkling. The spray or mist rising from the sea, must have descended upon them. To be baptized with spray or mist from the water of which the "wall" on their right hand and on their left* was composed, would not wet the ground. Scarcely a particle of it would be likely to touch the dry land on which they were walking through the sea. This must therefore have been the mode by which they were baptized; for to have baptized them in any other would have wet the ground. Then they would not have "passed through," but only partly "through, the—sea—by dry land."† As they were baptized in (εν) or with the waters of "the sea," and as they went through it on dry land; they must have been baptized in a mode that would not wet the ground. But as any other mode except sprinkling, would wet the ground; therefore they must have been baptized in the sea with its waters by sprinkling. Examples by the million of baptism by sprinkling are here presented.

6. *Every example of baptism with water mentioned in the scriptures, proves that sprinkling is one mode of administering that ordinance.* Whenever water is said to be applied to persons in this ordinance; the word baptize which signifies sprinkle(*a*) is employed. It is said of the three thousand on "the day of Pentecost;" they "were baptized."‡ It is also declared that Peter and Philip and Ananias and Paul and others "baptized persons.§ In all these cases, and in every other instance where any person is said to administer or receive this ordinance; the Greek word (βαπτιζω) for baptize is used. And, as this word signifies to sprinkle as one of its meanings, and as this is its only meaning definitely mentioned in the scriptures; so therefore in every example of baptism mentioned in Divine revelation where this word is used, (and it is used in them all,) sprinkling as one mode of baptism, is taught. Every example therefore of baptism with water mentioned in the whole book of God, shows that

*Ex. 14: 29. †Heb. 11: 29. (*a*) See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1 § 1; P. i, Ch. 1, § 2. 3. ‡Acts 2: 1. 41. §Acts 2: 38 and 8: 12. 38 and 9: 17. 18 and 10: 47. 48 and 22: 12 16, 1Cor. 1: 14. 16.

sprinkling is one, if not the only, mode of administering this ordinance.

7. *The scriptural evidence which proves sprinkling to be a mode of baptism, is clear and full.* That sprinkling is a mode of baptism, is taught, (1.) From the express language of scripture; (2.) From several millions of scriptural examples of this mode of baptism; (3.) From the meanings of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, one of which is to sprinkle; (4.) From the fact that (Βαπτω) the root from which the word for baptize is derived, often denotes to sprinkle; (5.) From the meaning of the Hebrew word (טבל) which is translated into Greek by the root of the word for baptize. This Hebrew word denotes to sprinkle, to wet a small part, &c. (6.) From the fact that what is signified by baptism is often said to be sprinkled; (7.) From the fact that literal sprinkling is a proper sign of that which is spiritual; (8.) From the fact that the uniform mode of performing scriptural ceremonial washings, is by sprinkling; (9.)From sprinkling being a proper baptismal seal; (10.) From the fact that sprinkling is the only mode which can become as universal as the commission to administer baptism, requires the ordinance to be administered(*a*). These, and the other evidences which have been noticed from the word of God, show most conclusively that sprinkling is a scriptural mode of baptism.

8. *If there is but one mode of baptism, that must be by sprinkling.* There is no definite evidence in the whole word of God to prove that immersion is a mode, and much less that it is the only mode of baptism(*b*). But that sprinkling is a mode of baptism, is taught by inspired men, in the most unequivocal language(*c*). If therefore there is but one mode of baptism; sprinkling, as it is often definitely taught in the word of God, both by precept and example, must be that mode.

The expression, "one baptism," says nothing of the mode. It does not say, one mode, or only one mode of baptism(*d*). It does not even teach that there is only one kind of baptism. It does not say, or intimate this. There may be,

(*a*)See on this section, Ch. 1, § 1; § 1-6; Ch. 1, § 2-13; B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. (*b*) See B. ii, P. 1, Ch. 5, § 1-6, § 7. (*c*) P. 1, Ch. 1, §1-7; and § 1-7. (*d*)B. i, P. iv, Ch. 2, § 2.

notwithstanding this expression, one kind of baptism administered by applying water to the person receiving the ordinance, and another kind by the Holy Spirit operating on the souls of men; and these may be entirely different from each other(*a*). If however there is only one mode by which the ordinance of christian baptism can be administered; that cannot be immersion. It must be by sprinkling; as this is the only mode definitely taught in the revelation which God has been pleased to give to mankind(*b*).

PART SECOND.

HUMAN AUTHORITY ON SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

LEXICONS AND DICTIONARIES ON SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

1. *Human authority is no part of the Christian's rule of duty in religious matters.* However numerous and learned the writers may be, who adopt a particular view, their authority is not the christian's rule of duty. This authority may be valuable in various respects. Men may direct the mind to the word of God. They may present, explain or enforce Divine truth. But their declarations, however plain and positive and learned and valuable, do not form any portion of the rule for man's religious duties. The word of God and that only is, and nothing else can be made, his rule of duty. Human authority on sprinkling as a mode of baptism, is here presented, not as any part of the christian's rule; but it is mentioned merely to show that immersers are nearly as destitute of evidence from this source to sustain their exclusive claims, as they are from the scriptures of truth.

2. *Greek Lexicons teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* Their mode of doing this is two-fold. (1.) They inform us that sprinkle is one meaning of the word (βαπτω) from which that for baptize is derived(*c*). Hence the derivative (βαπτιζω) which is also a diminutive of the same word (βαπτω) and therefore expresses less than its primitive, must signify to sprinkle; or rather to sprinkle with fewer or smaller

(*a*)B. i, P. iv, Ch. 2, § 2. (*b*)Ch. 1, § 3. (*c*)B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1.

drops than (βαπτω) its root. That the derivative cannot denote more, and may express less, than the primitive word from which it is derived, will be manifest from a few examples. Blackish is derived from black; reddish from red; wettish from wet; foolish from fool, &c. From these and other examples; it is evident that a derivative word cannot denote more than that from which it is derived. That blackish cannot denote more than black, reddish than red, whitish than white, &c., is too manifest to need illustration. (2.) Greek Lexicographers teach that the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize itself, signifies to sprinkle(*a*). Greek Lexicons therefore teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.

3. *Hebrew Lexicons teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* They say that (טבל) the word which is translated into Greek by (βαπτω) the root for baptize, signifies to sprinkle, to wet a small part, &c(*b*). The authority of these Lexicons is, therefore, in favor of the position that sprinkling is one, if not the only mode of baptism.

4. *English Dictionaries teach that sprinkling is one mode of baptism.* They call baptism a sprinkling with water(*c*). This they would not do, if they did not intend to inform men that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.

The Lexicographers in other ancient and modern languages might be here quoted, were it necessary, to sustain the position that the Lexicons and Dictionaries teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. In every language in which the word baptize is used, authority might be given to prove that sprinkling is one mode by which this ordinance may be administered. But to refer to more of this kind of authority, is deemed unnecessary. Lexicographers then, since they give sprinkle as one meaning of the word baptize, positively teach that sprinkling is a mode of administering the holy ordinance of christian baptism.

CHAPTER II.

OTHER WRITERS ON SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

1. *The Apocryphal writers teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* By one of these, it is said; "he that washeth"

(*a*)B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 1. (*b*)See P. i, Ch. 1 § 4. 5. (*c*)See Webster's Duodecimo Dictionary, New Haven edition 1806; B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 5.

(βαπτιζομενος) or baptizes "himself after—touching—a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing" (*a*). When the mode, in which a person who had touched a dead body was to be ceremonially cleansed, is mentioned; it is four times in one chapter said to be by sprinkling.* By comparing what is here said to have been done, with the mode of doing the same thing as mentioned in the word of God; we have a manifest instance of a baptismal ceremonial washing performed by sprinkling. Moreover, it is affirmed of Judith that she "washed" (εβαπτιζετο) or baptized "herself in" (επι) at, on or upon "a fountain of water in" (εν) or by "the camp" (*b*). That this was a ceremonial washing appears from the circumstances of the case. She was a Jewess (*c*). She would therefore perform her ceremonial washings after the manner of that nation. That the Jewish ceremonial washings were performed by sprinkling, cannot but be evident to any one who will read the Old Testament (*d*). These washings are very frequently said to be by sprinkling. As therefore this washing of Judith was a Jewish ceremonial washing, and as the word baptize which signifies to sprinkle is used; so this her washing must have been by sprinkling.

2. *The Greek Fathers (d) teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* All the principal, and perhaps the whole, of these, use the word (Βαπτιζω) for baptize, which signifies sprinkle, when they mention this ordinance. But none of them uses (εμβαπτω or εμβαπτιζω) one of the words which frequently signify immerse, to express the ordinance of baptism. They therefore, by using this word for baptism, show that they held to sprinkling as a mode of administering this ordinance. Of these Fathers, a number may here be named. (1.) Polycarp was born about the year A. D. 67, was converted to the christian faith in A. D. 81, and was martyred about the year 160. He was a disciple of John the apostle. (2.) Ireneus, of Lyons, in France, was born in the year A. D. 97, and died about the year 203. He was a disciple of Polycarp. (3.) Justin Martyr wrote an apology for the christians about the year A. D. 139. He expressly states that "sprinkling—with—water was" practiced by the heath-

(*a*) Ecclus. 34: 25 in Eng. called the Wisdom of Sirach 31: 30 in Greek. *See Num. 19: 13. 18. 19. 20. (*b*) Judith 12: 7. This camp contained at least 200,000 men, See Judith 7: 2. (*c*) Judith 8: 1 and 9: 1. 12. (*d*) P. i, Ch. 1, § 7. (*e*) These were early christians who wrote in Greek.

en "in imitation of—true baptism." The true baptism then must have been by sprinkling, or it could not have been imitated by this mode of applying water. Sprinkling does not, in any particular, imitate immersion. If immersion had, in the days of Justin, been a mode or the only mode of baptism, practiced by christians, the heathen would have imitated that mode, as almost all heathenish persons now do, who pretend to baptize. Of himself this Justin says; "having been a disciple of the apostles, I became a teacher of the nations." Here then is a disciple of the apostles, during the lifetime of several of their disciples, within forty years from the death of John the Divine, affirming that sprinkling is the true mode of baptism, which the heathen imitated. He wrote this at least twenty years before Polycarp's death; and sixty years or more before the death of Ireneus. Neither of these, nor any other writer, denies this statement made by Justin. The assertion of this martyred disciple of the apostles, as to a mere matter of fact, certainly deserves credit. (4.) Ignatius was another disciple of John the apostle. He suffered martyrdom about the year A. D. 107, perhaps before. Since Justin, a disciple of the apostles, taught that sprinkling was a mode of baptism; all their other disciples, and therefore Ignatius, must have learned and taught the same truth. (5.) Origen, about the year 250, uses (βαπτισμος) baptism, which signifies sprinkling, to denote this ordinance. But in his account of baptism he does not use a word which definitely signifies immersion. He saw his father beheaded for professing christianity. His grand-father and great-grand-father were also christians. By these, he would receive instruction almost or quite from the apostles. This Origen affirms that by Elijah's order; the "wood" upon the "altar" was baptized.* It is certain that the wood upon this altar was not taken up and then put entirely under water. (6.) Chrysostom, about the year 380, and many others, teach, by using a word (βαπτιζω) which signifies to sprinkle, when they speak of baptism, that sprinkling is a mode by which that ordinance may be administered(*a*).

3. *Latin Fathers teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* Only four of these will here be mentioned. But all

*1 Kings 18: 33, 34. (*a*) See Marsh, Wall, Mosheim, Milner, and other Ecclesiastical Historians.

the early christians who wrote in Latin, use language similar to these, when they mention baptism. (1.) Tertullian wrote about the year 200(*a*). In speaking of this ordinance, he uses the word (*baptismus* or *baptizo*,) baptism or baptize, not any of the words in the Latin language which signify immerse. (2.) Cyprian, about the year 250, and, (3.) Fidus, about the same time, teach that sprinkling is baptism. Indeed, Cyprian, of whom it is said; "he is a christian throughout" (*b*), expressly declares this fact (*c*). His language is too plain to be mistaken. (4.) Augustine wrote about the year 388 or 390, and for several years after. When he mentions baptism; he, like other Latin writers, uses words which frequently signify to sprinkle. These and other Latin Fathers, therefore teach that sprinkling is a made of baptism(*d*).

4. *Pedobaptist commentators on the scriptures, teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* Only a very few of the principal of these can be mentioned here. (1.) Henry (*e*)says of the eleven and their successors in the ministerial office; they were to "admit" persons "into the church—by sprinkling water upon them" in the ordinance of baptism. He then quotes the passages; I will "sprinkle clean water upon you," and he shall "sprinkle many nations,"* as prophetic descriptions of the mode by which baptism was to be administered in New Testament times. By these passages, it is clearly intimated that the commission to baptize, requires those to whom it is entrusted by the Great Head of the church, to administer this ordinance in the same way or mode which he, by his prophets, had predicted that it should be administered. Henry therefore clearly teaches that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. (2.) Dr. Thomas Scott(*f*), declares plainly that immersion is "certainly not the only mode of baptism." He also as positively affirms that "baptism" may be administered "by—sprinkling." (3.) Dr. Adam Clark(*g*), says that "immersion" is not the only mode of baptism, and also, that those who are "sprinkled" in the name of the

(a) He was the first Latin writer among christians whose works have reached our day. *(b)* See Milner's Ch. Hist. p. 103, Edinburgh Edit. 1835. *(c)* See Epis. 76 to Magnus. *(d)* See Marsh, Wall, Mosheim, Milner, and other Ecclesiastical Historians. *(e)* On Mat. 28: 16–20. *Ezek. 36: 25, Isa. 52: 15. *(f)* In his notes and criticisms on Mat. 3: 5. 6, Mark 7: 3. 4, Acts 16: 29-34, Rom. 6: 3. 4, 1 Cor. 10: 2, Heb. 6: 1–3. *(g)* On Mat. 3: 6 and 28: 19, Notes at the end of Mark's Gospel, Acts 19: 5.

Trinity are "evangelically baptized." Again he declares; "baptism—administered by—sprinkling, signifies a full consecration of the person to the service of that Being in whose name it is administered." He farther says, that "sprinkling" is a "legitimate" form "of baptism," and that "baptism is essentially performed by sprinkling." This language undoubtedly teaches that he believes sprinkling to be a mode of baptism. (4.) Guise in his Paraphrase, definitely teaches that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. Moreover, Owen, Doddridge, Wall, Bradbury, Bostwick, Towgood, Addington, Williams, Edwards, Miller, Evans(*a*), Alexander, Fleury, Bogardus, Fonda, Milligan, Prime, and a number of others(*b*), all able men, have written in favor of sprinkling being a mode of baptism. It is evident from the names here mentioned, that the principal Pedobaptist commentators and writers, maintain that sprinkling is one mode of baptism. When therefore it is affirmed, that these or other Pedobaptist writers, teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism, or that baptism cannot be administered by sprinkling; the name of the writer, and the page or chapter in his book, ought to be mentioned. These should be plainly pointed out before the eyes of Pedobaptists. Then they would be furnished with the only suitable proof which can be given to show that any of these writers do now teach or ever have taught that sprinkling is not a mode of baptism. Till this is done, evidence in favor of such a position is wanting. Besides, when an immerser has occasionally manifested so much temerity as to mention the name of a Pedobaptist writer as one who sustains his exclusive system, the assertion has always, upon examination, proved to be untrue. Instead of such Pedobaptist writers teaching that immersion is the only mode of baptism, they teach expressly that sprinkling is a legitimate mode of administering that ordinance. When therefore it is asserted that Pedobaptist writers teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism; men who yield their assent to that and to that only for the support of which they have good evidence, must beg leave to decline giving implicit confidence to these and similar statements, till at least one such writer is discovered by them.

The fact that several of the writers mentioned in this sec-

(*a*) See Buck, Art. Baptism. (*b*) See Ch. 3, § 1. 2.

tion, admit that immersion, as well as sprinkling, is a mode of baptism, does not in the least degree, sustain the exclusive claims of immersers. The position of the exclusives is, not that immersion is one mode of baptism, but that it is the only mode. That immersion is *a mode* of baptism, is one thing; and that it is the *only mode*, is a position essentially different. The latter is the ground taken by the exclusive immersers. To change their position, as if their only intention was to teach that immersion is one mode of baptism, when they really maintain that it is the only mode, proves their want of candor; not that immersion is the only mode of baptism. To change their ground thus, also shows that they feel how incapable they are of sustaining their exclusive claims by evidence brought to bear on the position they profess to maintain.

5. *Ancient monumental pictures and engravings prove that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* About fifty of these have been preserved. They indicate the mode of baptism practiced from about the year 300, till about the year A. D. 1100. By no one of these is immersion taught(*a*). In each of them, the water is represented as being applied to the person, not the person to the water. In all of them the water is uniformly represented as being sprinkled or poured upon the head of the person baptized. The recipient of the ordinance is sometimes represented as standing in the water and sometimes as standing out of it on the floor or on the ground. In every instance the administrator is represented as being entirely out of the water, while he is administering the ordinance. It is manifest therefore, that being in the water, was no part of the ordinance of baptism; for if it was, then baptism could not have been administered while the recipient was entirely out of it; as, according to these evidences, it often was. Of these monumental representations, at least five exhibit the baptism of Christ. In four of these, John is represented as sprinkling water on the head of our Saviour; and in one, as pouring it on him out of a small shell(*b*). It

(*a*) See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 4, § 2. (*b*) See the door of the church at Pisa; the church on the via Ostiensis at Rome; the church at Beneventa in Italy; the Baptistry at Ravenna in Italy; (this represents the baptism of Christ by sprinkling, and is dated A. D. 451;) the church in Cosmedine at Ravenna, (it represents the baptism of Christ and is dated in 401;) a sculptural monument at Chigia near Naples, in Italy; one at Rome; the church of Lawrence, without the walls of Rome; the Baptistry of Pontianus near Rome; Arringhius, Eusebius, &c.

is manifest therefore that by these ancient monumental pictures and engravings, sprinkling, as a mode of baptism, is taught.

CHAPTER III.

DENOMINATIONS ON SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM.

1. *Christians in general maintain that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.* They teach this both by precept and example. Of the one hundred and seventy-five millions of professing christians in the world(*a*), more than one hundred and seventy millions admit that sprinkling is a mode of baptism; and more than one hundred and forty millions practice that mode. Of these millions of professing christians, at least seventy-five millions are Romanists; not less than thirty millions are connected with the Greek church; and about sixty-five millions are professedly Protestant. The Romanists all sprinkle in what they call baptism; the Greek church do not exclude sprinkling from being one mode of baptism, though they usually immerse persons and call that baptism(*b*). They also sometimes baptize by sprinkling(*c*). But the intelligent Protestant will not admit that the authority of these, is of much consequence; as they do not even profess to take the unadulterated word of God for their only rule in all religious duties. But the authority of sixty-five millions of professed Protestants may be noticed. Of these less than one million wholly reject baptism with water. About the same number maintain that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Here then are more than sixty millions of Protestants who teach, both by precept and example, that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. From the facts here stated, it is certainly true that professing christians in general, maintain that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.

2. *Many large denominations teach that this is one mode of administering the ordinance of baptism.* A few of these may here be named. That sprinkling is a mode of baptism, was taught by the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., of the early and middle ages. It is also held, (1.) By the church of Scotland; (2.) By the Free Assembly of Scotland; (3.) By the

(*a*) In this estimate all are included, who are not Pagans, Mahometans or modern Jews. (*b*) B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 3, § 1. 2. (*c*) Deylingius, Salt, Eusebius.

Associate, the Associate Reformed, the Reformed Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed, the German Reformed, and by the Relief Presbyterian churches; (4.) By the Episcopal church in Europe and in America; (5.) By the Presbyterian church, (Old and New School;) (6.) By the Cumberland Presbyterians; (7.) By the Methodists, (of different kinds;) (8.) By the Congregationalists and Independents; (9.) By the Irish Presbyterians; (10.) By the Gallican church; (11.) By the Lutherans in Europe and in America; (12.) By the Reformed church of Holland, Germany, France, &c. These all maintain that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. Even the Sabian Disciples of John the Baptist, as they call themselves, and the Menonite Baptists in Holland, admit that sprinkling is one mode of baptism (*a*). Most of these denominations are large, intelligent, respectable and pious. Some of them adhere very strenuously to the position that nothing is, or can be made by man, any part of christianity, either in doctrine or practice, which is not clearly taught in the word of God. Even immersers themselves, will not dispute the piety and learning of the ministry and laity of at least one half of these denominations. The authority then of more than 30 millions of persons, embracing many of acknowledged and deep-toned, scriptural piety, accurate and extensive learning, conscientious adherence to the word of God as their only rule in all religious duties, and a habitual willingness to be directed by "the law" and "the testimony,"* must be conclusive, so far as human authority can decide this matter.

Moreover, it is a remarkable fact, worthy of a passing notice here, that no class of persons who maintain that immersion is the only mode of baptism (*b*), do now or ever did require their public religious teachers to be thoroughly educated men. Besides, the exclusives are not at all scrupulous in their practical adherance to the word of God in their religious exercises. As examples of their deviations from the scriptures in what they call religion; several instances may be mentioned. (1.) They often use anxious seats. (2.) They frequently wear long beards. (3.) Many of them, for years, maintained the notion that the day of judgement was

(*a*) See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 3, § 2, Wolf, Ward's Letters, See also Dr. S. Miller, J. P. Perrin, Morland, &c. *Isa. 8: 20. (*b*) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 6, § 6, par. 3.

to take place in the year 1843, or before April 1st, 1844. (4.) They sometimes even violate the commands of God under the name of religion. They not unfrequently violate that command; "let your women keep silence in the churches,"* and that which requires men to "remember the Sabbath day" and "keep it holy;" and also *that* which says, "thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."† Since they can mistake the violation of some of the positive commands of God for religious service; and since they can so readily violate others; their authority in matters of religion, even if they were equally numerous, might be questioned with much greater propriety than that of those millions who take the word of God, both in principal and in practice, for their only rule in all religious duties.

3. *Councils, Synods and Assemblies, hold to sprinkling as a mode of baptism.* Only a very small portion of the principal of these can be mentioned here. (1.) The council at Attica in Africa, may be mentioned. This was composed of sixty-six pastors or bishops. Cyprian was its president. It was literally a council of martyrs. It was held in A. D. 253. (2.) The council of Eliberis was convened in the year 305. (3.) The second council of Carthage met in A. D. 397; another in the same place, in 400; another in 401; another in Rome in 402. (4.) The fifth council of Carthage assembled in the year 416. (5.) The Synod of Dort held its sessions in the years 1618 and 1619. (6.) The Westminster Assembly(*a*) held its sessions from the year 1642 till 1648 (*b*). These, together with the Synod of Cambridge Massachusetts which met in 1649, and a multitude of others, all teach in some form of words, that sprinkling is a mode of baptism(*c*). Such an amount of human authority, presents itself in favor of sprinkling being a mode of baptism, that it almost overwhelms the mind. No human testimony can possibly be more convincing than what christians present on this subject.

All these believe and habitually teach that sprinkling is a

*1 Cor. 14. 34. †Ex. 20: 8. 16. *(a)* See the Minutes of these Councils, Synods and Assemblies. *(b)* This Assembly met at Westminster in London, July, 1642. It held 1163 sessions. It continued its meeting by successive adjournments till, after having sat five years seven months and twenty-two days, it was dissolved early in the year 1648. It was composed of 151 members. Of these 121 were ministers, eminent for piety and learning This Assembly was unanimously in favor of sprinkling being a mode of baptism. They also decided by a majority of one that immersion was baptism. *(c)* See Ecclesiastical Histories generally; also, Platform, Ch. 12, § 7.

mode of baptism. They uniformly reverence the authority of God. They manifest habitual love to him and to his cause. They read the scriptures with prayerful attention, to ascertain what the will of the Lord is. They love righteousness. They take pleasure in obeying the Divine commands. With all this piety, this devotion to the service of God, this earnest anxiety to learn what he teaches in his word; they believe and habitually affirm that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. If this their uniform assertion is not true, then they are all guilty of habitual lying. They all assert habitually that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. If it is not so; then, every time they make the assertion, they are guilty of uttering a solemn falsehood. They must therefore be habitual liars, or sprinkling must be what they constantly affirm it to be, a mode of baptism. Habitual liars are not christians,—are not even moral men. Millions and tens of millions of persons who, to all appearance, are true, devoted followers of the Lamb, now declare, and hundreds of millions, not a few of whom have suffered martyrdom for their religion, have heretofore, while they lived on earth, habitually declared sprinkling to be a mode of baptism taught in the word of God. If this their uniform declaration is not true; then all these professing christians,—these martyred followers of the blessed Saviour, are living, or have lived and died, with a "lie in" their "right hand." And we know that "all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."* Such a charge brought against the great body of professing christians, ought to be sustained by at least one explicit passage of scripture. To say that the knowledge of these persons is or was defective on this subject is but a sorry apology for them. Men of veracity take care to know that what they habitually affirm is true. They do not regularly affirm that for truth of which they have no knowledge. When men uniformly declare that sprinkling is a mode of baptism; they either tell the truth, or this their declaration is not true. If it is false, then those who constantly make it, are habitually uttering a most solemn falsehood. But those who are guilty of doing this, are habitual liars. Who, on the mere unsupported assertion of

*Rev. 21: 8.

a few immersers can believe that all these millions of professing christians are, or were, while they lived, habitual liars? Those who cannot do this, must believe that sprinkling is a mode of baptism.

The charge of being thus guilty of "lying" and of being "monomaniacs" or deranged in relation to the subject of baptism, is by immersers, brought, in plain, unvarnished language, against all who baptize infants by sprinkling. These and many other similar expressions, are used in relation to them(*a*). If these charges are true, then all who baptize infants by sprinkling, must be most odiously wicked persons. To say that a lying rebel against the king of Zion, is a christian, is a gross perversion of language. Before men of intelligence and candor can believe such charges to be true, they must have more evidence to sustain them than the mere assertion of those who, without a blush, can alter the word of God to make it suit their own system.

A GENERAL VIEW

OF SPRINKLING AS A MODE OF BAPTISM, PRESENTED IN A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A BAPTIZER AND AN IMMERSER.

IMMERSER. Mr. Baptizer, do you believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism?

BAPTIZER. I do not.

I. Why do you not believe that immersion is the only mode of Baptism?

B. Because, in the word of God, there is no precept, no example, no evidence of any kind to prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

I. Do you believe that immersion is one mode of baptism?

B. I cannot say that I do. That which has no scriptural evidence to sustain its claims to be a mode of baptism; that which is not even mentioned in the whole of Divine revelation as a mode of baptism, can scarcely be called a christian ordinance, by those who take the word of God and that only, for their rule of duty. That there is no evidence in scripture to sustain the claims of immersion(*b*) is perfectly certain. No one can find any positive evidence in the scriptures to prove immersion to be a mode of baptism; for this

(*a*) See Bliss on baptism, p. 40. 66. 201. (*b*) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 5, § 1-4.

plain reason ; no such evidence is recorded in God's word(*a*).

I. Do you believe that baptism with water is an ordinance of Divine appointment to be observed in the New Testament church ?

B. I do ; for there is positive scriptural evidence to prove that baptism with water is to be observed in the christian church till the end of time(*b*).

I. In what mode of baptism do you believe ?

B. I believe that sprinkling is a scriptural mode of administering the ordinance of christian baptism.

I. Have you any evidence for this your belief ?

B. I have much ; and it is as positive as language can make it.

I. Do the scriptures in any passage, positively teach that sprinkling is a mode of baptism ?

B. They do, in many passages and in different forms of expression(*c*).

I. Does the word baptize ever denote sprinkle ?

B. It does frequently(*d*).

I. Does God in the scriptures command persons to be sprinkled as a mode of baptism ?

B. He does, in every passage where baptism with water is commanded(*e*).

I. Are there any scriptural examples of sprinkling as a mode of baptism ?

B. There are, hudreds, thousands, millions of such examples(*f*).

I. Do wise and good men admit that sprinkling is a mode of baptism ?

B. Yes; millions of them do. Indeed, almost the whole of the professedly christian world maintain that sprinkling is a mode of baptism(*g*).

I. Do not a very few wise and good men deny that sprinkling, in the name of the Trinity, is a mode of baptism ?

B. Some few that are so called, deny this. But if they were men of knowledge on this subject, they could not believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism ; and if they were really good men, they would not maintain what

(a) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 5, §1–4. *(b)* See B. i, P. 1, Ch. 2, § 2-4. *(c)* P. 1, Ch. 1, § 1-13. *(d)* P. 1, Ch. 1, § 2. 4. *(e)* P. 1, Ch. 1, § 12. *(f)* P. 1, Ch. 2, § 1-5. *(g)* Ch. i, Ch. 2, § 1-5. Ch. 3, § 1-3.

they did not believe. It may therefore be doubted, with much propriety, whether any truly good man, thoroughly acquainted with this subject, ever really believed the notion that immersion is the only mode of baptism. But if wise and good men did believe it, their belief would not prove it to be true. If a wise and good man believes a falsehood, his belief will not change the falsehood into truth.

I. Is not the word baptize of Greek origin?

B. It is. This word was transferred from the Greek into English at a very early period in the history of our language.

I. Is it right to transfer words from one language into another?

B. It certainly is. In doing so, there can be no manner of impropriety.

I. If the word baptize may without sin, be transferred from Greek into English; why may not every word in that language be transferred into ours? Now I've cornered you.

B. If there is no sin in transferring the low Latin word *immerse* from that language into English, why may we not transfer all low words from that language into ours?

I. Really, I do not know. I never thought of that before.

B. Then I will tell you. There would, in reality, be no sin in transferring all the words in any one language into any other. Words which now compose parts of the English language have been transferred from more than twenty others. The Saxon is generally, and with propriety, considered the original of the English language. The Saxon is a dialect of the Old Teutonic. From this last originated the present German and other Gothic languages. When the Saxons invaded Britain, their language embraced comparatively few words. Having become masters of the English Island they used their own language in all governmental transactions. This rude and uncultivated people soon intermingled with the ancient Britains who were equally uncultivated. As they extended their knowledge by science and commerce, they adopted from other languages, such words as they needed to express to each other their newly-acquired thoughts. In this way they enriched the English language

with the addition of many foreign words. They had no term originally in their language, which would express all that (βαπτιζω) the word for baptize signifies. They therefore transferred or adopted that word into their own language. Did they do wrong in doing this ?

I. I think not. But do you really believe that sprinkling is the only mode of baptism ?

B. I cannot say that I do. It is however the only mode expressly taught in the word of God ; and if there is but one mode of baptism, that must certainly be by sprinkling(*a*).

I. Why, you tear immersion up by the roots ; and I won't hear another word from you on the subject.

B. Do not be displeased with me. I am not to blame, because God in his word, has not taught that immersion is the only mode of baptism. Nor is it my fault that men will not read and believe what the scriptures declare in relation to this subject. God's word, plainly and positively and repeatedly, teaches that sprinkling is a mode of baptism. I am not to blame for this ; am I ?

I. I won't hear any more from you on this subject. You make it so plain, every person will soon believe in sprinkling; and then, O, what will become of my dear, favorite scheme of immersion ! ! This too, you accomplish, without altering Divine revelation to make it suit your views of baptism ; while I had to alter the Bible to obtain some faint shadow of evidence to prove that immersion is even one mode of baptism. O, my immersion, you're overthrowing that ! ! How can I live, if my own dear immersion is exposed in all its naked deformity ! ! This you are doing. For this you are to blame. I'll hear no more of this. I'll leave you.

B. Farewell, Mr. Immerser. I pray the Lord to give you light to perceive and grace to receive God's truth in love.

I. I tell you I won't hear you any longer.

B. He's gone. How unwilling he is to receive the truth on this subject. Perhaps God has given him up to believe a lie, because he was willing to be led blindfolded into this maze of error. When the truth flashes on his intellect, he appears to hate it. May the Lord give him grace. May he teach him, and every other immerser, to read and believe

(*a*) P. i, Ch. 2, § 8.

and love his own holy word; and then they will all soon forsake their exclusive system, unsupported as it is, by the scriptures of truth.

BOOK FOURTH.

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

PART FIRST.

BAPTISM INCLUDED IN CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH OF GOD DEFINED.

1. *The church is a society.* This appears from the fact that it is composed of persons united together for certain purposes. The word church is, in the scriptures, used in a variety of senses. In each of them it denotes a society of persons or its officers. The term "churches" in the plural number, is often found in the word of God.* It then denotes different branches of this society. The word church is sometimes used to signify the whole society† and sometimes only a part of it.‡ Moreover, its officers are occasionally expressed by the word church.§

2. *The church is a religious society.* The very design of this society is to unite for religious purposes. In every passage of scripture where the church of Christ, in any of its branches, is mentioned; this fact is either expressed or taken for granted(*a*). The original word (εκκλησια) for church frequently signifies any assembly of people met for any purpose.‖ But the *church* of Christ always denotes a religious society.

3. *The church is a society in covenant with God.* Each member of this society is bound in covenant to believe all that God teaches in his word, and to obey all his requirements. This is the very nature of the covenant into which every person enters who unites with any branch of this society. By the very act of joining a church, a person ratifies this covenant relation.

4. *This covenant has a seal or seals and parties.* A seal is, in fact, an essential part of a covenant. It is that which confirms its promise to the party to whom it is made. No

*See Acts 9: 31 and 15: 41 and 16: 5, Rom. 16: 16, 1 Cor. 7: 17 and 11: 16 and 14: 33. 34, Gal. 1: 2, Rev. 1: 4. 11. 20 and 2: 7. 11. 17. 23. 29 and 3: 6. 13. 22 and 22: 16. †See Acts 2: 47 and 15: 22, Eph. 1: 22, &c. ‡See Acts 11: 26, 1 Cor. 16. 19, &c. §See Mat. 18: 17, &c. (*a*) References in § 1. ‖See Acts 19: 39. 41 in Eng. and 39. 40 in Greek.

covenant can therefore be complete without a seal or seals. Parties are also essential to the very existence of a covenant. It is a solemn, sealed agreement, made between the parties. God and the church, in its members or in its head, are the parties in the covenant which constitutes this society.* The promise of the covenant is sealed and sure to all who, by themselves or by their substitute, perform its stipulations.†

CHAPTER II.

THE INVISIBLE CHURCH INCLUDES SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

1. *Uninspired men cannot certainly know who are the members of this church.* On this account it is frequently, and not improperly, called the invisible church. The commencement of true grace in the soul is often imperceptible to human beings.‡ It is with propriety therefore that this church is called invisible. Besides, some of its members have passed into the unseen world; and others are not yet born. These of course are not visible to man on earth.

2. *All its members are included in the covenant of grace.* This is "the church—which" Christ "hath purchased with his own blood."§ Its members compose "God's elect."‖ They all have been, or will be truly regenerated by the Spirit of God,¶ and eventually taken to eternal rest. This is "the church" over which Christ is the spiritual "head."** All its members are or certainly will be saved through the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ its glorious Redeemer.¶‖

3. *The parties in this covenant are God the Father and Christ as the representative and substitute of his people.* Christ is often mentioned as "head" of this "church," and as a substitute for his people, for his "sheep."** The Lord Jesus Christ is therefore the head or representative, and the substitute of his people. This covenant was made between the Father and the Son as the head of his people.††

4. *Adults and infants are interested in this covenant.* A part of these entered heaven before the death of Christ; a

*See Gen. 17: 11. 1 Chron. 16: 15. Ps. 50: 5 and 89: 3. 28. 34. Isa. 56: 4. Acts 3: 25. Gal. 3: 17, &c. †See Rom. 4: 11. 12. ‡See Luke 17: 20. 21. §Acts 20: 28. ‖Isa. 65: 9. 22. Mat. 24: 22. 24. 31. Rom. 8: 33 and 9: 11 and 11: 5. 7. Col. 3: 12. 2 Tim. 2: 10. 1 Thess. 1: 4, &c. ¶See John 6: 37. 39. 45. 65 and 10: 16. 27–29. Rom. 8: 28–39. Heb. 12: 23. 1 Pet. 1: 5. **Eph. 1: 22. See also Eph. 4: 15 and 5: 23. Isa. 53: 4. 5. 6. 8. 11. 12. John 10: 11. 15. 26–29. ††Ps. 89: 3. 15–19. 27. 28. 34. 37. Zach. 6: 13.

portion have left this world since; some live on earth at present; and some are not yet born. That both infants and adults are interested in this covenant, appears from the express language of scripture. God says of those in this covenant; "I will give them one heart that they may fear me forever, for the good of them and of their children after them."* Here parents and "their children" are both expressly mentioned as having an interest in this covenant. Its promise is made alike to both. It is "for the good of them" and "of their children." That some infants are saved, few persons will deny. But if any ever were or ever will be saved, then infants are included in this covenant. Such infants as are saved, must belong to Christ as a part of his people; as a portion of his flock. Several infants are mentioned in the scriptures, as being interested in the grace of this covenant. Among these, may be noticed the child of David, the child of Jereboam, together with Jeremiah and John the Baptist†(*a*). It is therefore undeniably certain, that both adults and infants are interested in the covenant of grace; for it is certain that some of both classes have been saved.

5. *The covenant of grace has a seal.* This is essential to it as a covenant. This "seal" is often mentioned in the word of God. It is called the "circumcision—of the heart," spiritual baptism, a being "born again,"—"born of the Spirit,"—"born of God,"‡ and the like. Those therefore who are in this covenant, either have been or will be "sealed" with "the Holy Spirit of God."§

6. *This invisible church is one.* It is made up of all true believers in every age and country. (1.) These are called "one." (2.) They have one "head." (3.) They have one regenerating Spirit by which they "are sealed." (4.) They have "one God and Father." (5.) They have one rule to which to conform in all their religious principles and practices. This is the Spirit speaking in the scriptures. (6.) They, together, constitute the "one body" of Christ. (7.) They are one "building." (8.) They have one "foundation."‖ From these evidences, it is clear that the true,

*Jer. 32: 39. †See 2 Sam. 12: 22. 23, 1 Kings 14: 1. 3. 12. 13, Jer. 1: 5, Luke 1: 15, (*a*)See P. ii, Ch. 4, § 3. ‡See 2 Tim. 2: 19, Rom. 2: 28. 29, Deut. 10: 16 and 30: 6, Jer. 4: 4, Col. 2: 11, Eph. 4: 30, Mat. 3: 11, John 1: 12. 13 and 3: 3. 5. 6. 7. §Eph. 4: 30. ‖John 17: 21-24, Gal. 3: 28, 1 Cor. 10: 17, Eph. 1: 22. 23 and 4: 4-6. 15. 16, See Isa. 8: 20, Ps. 19: 7, 1 Cor. 3: 9, Isa. 28: 16, Eph. 2: 20.

spiritual and holy church of Christ is one; and that each member of it is included in the covenant of grace. It is also manifest that they are all true christians, or are yet to be made such by the new-creating power of the Holy Spirit.* The most of these are, have been or will be, in visible covenant relation with God, but not all. This our Saviour teaches in his address to the thief on the cross. He says to him; "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."† That this malefactor was saved is certain; but there is no evidence that he was ever in visible covenant relation with God.

CHAPTER III.

BAPTISM WITH WATER INCLUDED IN VISIBLE CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

1. *God organized a visible church.* This is certain, from the fact that there is a visible church on earth. If God had not organized a church, then there could not possibly have been any organized society which could at any time have unitedly rendered him acceptable service. To act without God's authority, is not serving him. It is rebellion against his commands which require mankind to "obey his voice,"‡ and to go "to the law and to the testimony" for directions§ in all religious duties. That there is on earth a church, or a society of persons in visible covenant relation with God, is positive proof that it was organized by him; or that it was, in some way and at some period of time, received into covenant by him.

2. *God organized the visible church in the days of Abram.* God had his people on earth before this date. They served him in a visible form. This was by offering sacrifices according to his appointment.‖ Before this, God had not entered into a special covenant with his professed servants. But "when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to" him, "and said;"—"I will make my covenant between me and thee;"—"I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee;"—"I will multiply thee;"—"Thou shalt be a father of many na-

*See Eph. 2: 10. †Luke 23: 43. ‡Deut. 13: 4, Josh. 24: 24, 1 Sam. 12: 14, Jer. 7: 23, Acts 5: 29, Rom. 6: 16, 2 Thess. 1: 8, Heb. 5: 9, &c. §Isa. 8: 20. ‖See Ps. 50: 5, Heb. 11: 4.

tions;"—"I will give unto thee and to thy seed—all the land of Canaan; and I will be their God.* (*a*). Here is the covenant definitely mentioned. Its promise is also plainly stated. Moreover, God pointed out to Abram what, in this covenant, was to be required of him and of his seed. This is done in positive language. He says to him; "Walk before me and be thou perfect;"—"Thou shalt keep my covenant—thou and thy seed;"—"My covenant shall be in your flesh."† To this Abram agreed for himself and for his seed. This is evident from the account of this whole transaction. Moreover, it was necessary, in order to complete the covenant, that he should accept its stipulations, or agree to the demands which it proposed. These were all evidently and perfectly just. With them he could not therefore with propriety refuse to comply. The "seal" or "token" of this covenant, is expressly named. This was circumcision. "Every man-child among you shall be circumcised;"—"Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin."‡ In this covenant one party is God; adults and infants compose the other. Abram, an adult, "ninety years old and nine," Ishmael, a lad of "thirteen," and Isaac, an infant, "eight days old," were all circumcised to comply with the stipulations of this covenant.§ This was to them the "token"—"sign" or "seal" of this "covenant."‖ We have here then presented, (1.) The condescension of God. He proposes to enter into covenant with a man and his seed, both literal and spiritual.¶ (2.) The covenant which is proposed on the part of God, is accepted on the part of Abram. (3.) The covenant requirements are mentioned. (4.) The promise of the covenant is definitely made. This is two-fold. It proposes temporal blessing to all who sustain this covenant relation. It also includes spiritual blessings for all who, by the grace of their substitute, perfectly comply with its stipulations. All spiritual blessings are included in that part of the promise expressed in this language; "I will be a God

*Gen. 17: 1. 2. 4. 7. 8. *(a)* Not the most distant hint is contained in the whole word of God of a church being organized in the days of John the Baptist. No covenant is mentioned either directly or indirectly; no seal of a covenant; no transferable commission was given him (See B. i, P. iii, Ch. 1, § 6.) He was sent to baptize and make the Lord Jesus Christ manifest to Israel, not to organize a church. To do this was no part of the duty which his commission as forerunner of Christ required him to perform. This will be manifest to any one who will take the trouble to read what John was required to do. †Gen. 17: 1. 9. 13. ‡Gen. 17: 10. 11. §Gen. 17: 24. 25 and 21: 4. ‖Gen. 17: 11, Rom. 4: 11. ¶See Gal. 3: 7–9. 14. 29.

unto thee and to thy seed." (5.) There is a visible seal mentioned as belonging to this covenant. This is one of its necessary parts. Without this, the external covenant relation between God and his visible people, would have been incomplete. (6.) The parties in this covenant are mentioned. A covenant always supposes parties. Without these it could not therefore have existed. Here then are presented all the parts complete of a visible church organization. No one part is wanting. None is defective. The right to organize this church, being from God, was perfect. In every part of its organization, Divine wisdom is clearly exhibited. It is perfectly manifest therefore that in the days of Abram, the visible church of God was organized.

3. *This visible church organization, in all its parts, is permanent.* This appears from several considerations. (1.) There is nothing in the nature of the parties, or in the covenant, or in the design which God had in forming a visible church on earth, or in his purposes of mercy towards men, which, in the nature of things, would disorganize this church. (2.) There could be no necessity, so far as God or man might be interested in the church, for dissolving this organization, and leaving the world again to uncovenanted mercies. (3.) If God should disorganize this church in the formation of which his wisdom was displayed, no greater or different wisdom would be exhibited in another. If this therefore should be disorganized, as the same wisdom and the same power would be manifested in organizing another; the last would be precisely like the first in every thing essential to church organization. It cannot be supposed therefore that a Being of perfect wisdom, would disorganize a church of his own formation, merely for the purpose of organizing it again. (4.) There is positive evidence that this church is permanent in its duration. *The covenant which is essential to its existence, is permanent.* It is expressly and repeatedly called "an everlasting covenant."* As there is nothing in the covenant, or in the parties, or in the nature of things, to limit its duration; men have no right to do so. This covenant therefore will continue while the earth remains, in all its parts which belong to the church in time, and through eternity in all

*Gen. 17: 7. 13. 19, Ps. 105: 10.

its parts which relate specially to the world of spirits. Always after this covenant was made in the days of Abram, *those to whom its seal was applied, are represented as being the professed people of God.* They are called the "people of God;" "the congregation of the Lord;"—the "Israel" of God;—his "chosen" people;—"a holy people;"—a people in "covenant;"—a "peculiar people,"* &c. This language clearly teaches that those interested in the Abrahamic covenant, composed the visible church of God, from and after its organization. They are expressly denominated "the church in the wilderness,"† through which the Israelites passed in going from Egypt to Canaan. The ceremonial "law which was" given more than "four hundred years after" this covenant was made, did not, could not, disannul it, so as to render its promise ineffectual.‡ The positive language of scripture therefore, together with all the circumstances of the case, shows clearly that the church organized in the days of Abram, is perpetual in its duration.

4. *The covenant into which God entered with Abram and his seed, was not disannulled, but confirmed by our Saviour.* This is positively declared by inspired men. Of Christ's personal appearance on earth, the prophet says; "he shall confirm the covenant with many," not make another with them. He confirmed this "covenant" by personally receiving its seal. He was circumcised. He also complied with all its other demands, and so it was confirmed by him. He confirmed "the promises made" in this covenant "unto the fathers." To do this he became "a minister of the circumcision." It is also said of this whole "covenant," that it was "confirmed of God, in Christ," before the ceremonial law was given.§ Since this Abrahamic covenant was "confirmed—in Christ;" it is perfectly certain that he did not disannul it. To disannul and to confirm are perfectly opposite to each other. What Christ confirms he does not therefore disannul.

5. *The visible church organized in the days of Abraham, is and will remain, essentially one in every subsequent age till the end of time.* This unity of the visible church, does not

*Ps. 73: 10 and 81: 11, Isa. 63: 8, Rom. 9: 25, Heb. 11: 25, Num. 16: 3, 1 Kings 8: 16. 17, Isa. 44: 1. 2, Deut. 28: 9, Ps. 74: 20, Deut. 14: 2, &c. †Acts 7: 38. ‡See Gal. 3: 17. §Dan. 9: 27, See Luke 2: 21, Rom. 15: 8, Gal. 3: 17.

suppose, that all its members must live at the same time; nor that it has one visible head; nor that there should be but one denomination; nor that all its members must be equally pure; nor external agreement in every point. But it does suppose, that they all sustain a visible covenant relation to God. That the visible church is one or that all and each of its members are in covenant with God, appears from many declarations made in the scriptures. (1.) It is expressly called "one;" Christ "hath made both" Jews and Gentiles "one." (2.) It has one "head," the Lord Jesus Christ. (3.) It "is his body." (4.) It is represented as one "church," one "pillar," one "house," one "city," one "temple," one "Zion," one "Jerusalem," one "kingdom,"* &c. (5.) In all ages since its organization, it has had one "covenant"—"confirmed" in Christ; one promise of this covenant including temporal and spiritual blessings, and a seal of the same spiritual import(*a*).† (6.) The whole visible church is mentioned as one "olive-tree," as the collective "branches" of one vine, and as having externally one description of members. Of these some are truly united to Christ by faith and others only nominally so.‡ (7.) It has one Saviour, Christ, and one way of justification through his righteousness imputed to the soul.§ (8.) Its members have had, and will, at all times, have one Spirit to convert, sanctify and renew the soul; to give true faith and true repentance, with all the other christian graces and affections, to each one of God's elect among them.‖ Moreover it may be observed here, that Zion, the collective body of his people, while they retain their former appellations, have, in New Testament times, been "called by a new name" as the prophet predicted.¶ It is the same Old Testament Zion, not a new one, which, under the New dispensation, was to have a "new name." The same Zion with an additional new name, cannot be, on that account, a new Zion or church.

6. *Members of this church have a right to the visible seal of the covenant.* A covenant is a solemn agreement between parties. The seal is an essential part of it. By this, the

*Eph. 1: 22, 23 and 2: 14–22 and 3: 21 and 4: 3–13. 15. 16, 1 Tim. 3: 15, 1 Cor. 12: 12. 13, Ps. 2: 6 and 48: 12 and 146: 10 and 147: 12, Isa. 62: 1, Rev. 3: 12, Jer. 7: 4, 1 Cor. 3: 16. 17, Mat. 8: 12. (*a*)See § 1–4. †1 Tim. 4: 8, Rom. 4: 11. ‡Rom. 11: 11–26, John 15: 5. 6, Mat. 25: 1. 2. §See Rom. 3: 22. 26. 28. 29. ‖Acts 11: 18, Eph. 2: 8, Heb. 12: 2. 2 Pet. 1: 3, Rom. 8: 33. ¶That is, christians; See Isa. 62: 2, compared with Acts 11: 26.

promise made in the covenant is confirmed. The bargain therefore must be made, the agreement entered into, before it can be sealed. This agreement may be made by the parties themselves, or by their representatives properly appointed. When an agreement is confirmed by a seal, it then becomes a covenant, complete in all its parts. If a person neglects or refuses to confirm a solemn agreement made with him and which requires this confirming token, he becomes thereby a covenant-breaker. Of such a person, God says; "he hath broken my covenant."* A person cannot break a covenant with which he is not connected as a party. But the moment he is thus in covenant, by his own act or by that of a Divinely appointed representative, its promise then becomes his and he has a right to its confirming seal. Members of the visible church sustain to God a visible covenant relation. They are a party in the covenant. They therefore have a right to its seal whatever that may be. If those who are in covenant are not entitled to its seal, then no persons can be; for those who are not in it cannot claim its promise, much less the seal by which that promise is confirmed.

7. *The engagements of this Abrahamic covenant are perpetually binding.* This arises from its very nature. Those in this covenant are always bound in covenant to perform all its requirements. They may neglect or refuse to do this; and by this course of conduct, they may lose a right to the blessings promised in it. They then become "covenant-breakers;"† but this does not free them from its obligations. They may be, by acts of discipline, suspended or excluded from the privileges of the covenant. But then they are members suspended or excluded from its blessings. They are not thereby released from one of its obligations. These acts of discipline, however just or unjust, do not, cannot, excuse the party from his covenant obligations. He is still bound in covenant to fulfill all its stipulations. Such "covenant-breakers" are guilty of a double sin. They break God's law and transgress his covenant. As there is no way by which a person can escape from these covenant engagements, they must therefore be perpetual.

8. *Adults and infants are members of the visible church*

*See Gen. 17: 14. †See Lev. 26: 15, Hos. 6: 7, Rom. 1: 31.

which God has organized. In the covenant entered into when this church was organized, there were two parties. God was one party; and the other was composed of adults and infants. Men do not often, attempt to exclude God from being a party in this covenant. But they sometimes break in upon the other party. It is however, from scripture, manifest, (1.) *That adults constituted one portion of this party in the covenant at its formation.* This is *plainly taught* by the express language of "Divine Revelation." "Abram" and "all the men of his house" and "Ishmael," are expressly mentioned as being a portion of one of the parties in this covenant.* These therefore, were all "circumcised." In New Testament times adults are represented as being members of the visible church which had been organized. The "Lord added to the church—such as should be saved." Of these, "men and women" are expressly mentioned."† (2.) Infants are also definitely mentioned as forming the other portion of this party in the covenant. This appears (1.) from the express language of scripture. "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised." He "that is born in thy house—must—be circumcised." The "uncircumcised man-child—shall be cut off from his people."‡ Here infants at eight days old, are expressly recognized as being in this covenant. They are acknowledged as members of this church. To them, by the positive command of God, the seal of this covenant was to be applied. (2.) Infants as members of this church were to be and were actually circumcised. Isaac, John the Baptist and our Saviour are all mentioned as being circumcised in obedience to the engagements entered into in this covenant.§ Infants therefore formed a portion of one of the parties in the covenant into which God entered with Abraham and his seed when he first organized the visible church. *Infants yet form a part of the members of this one only visible church which God organized.* This appears (1.) From the fact that *God who constituted them members of his church at its formation, has not excluded them from it or from its seal.* He expressly mentioned them as a portion of one party in the covenant. He commanded its seal to be applied to them. That party in the covenant made up of

*See Gen. 17: 2. 4. 7. 23–27. †Acts 2: 41. 47 and 8: 12. ‡Gen. 17: 10. 12. 14, Lev. 12: 3. §See Gen. 21: 4, Luke 1: 59. 60 and 2: 21.

human beings, was not composed of adults alone, nor of infants alone. Both these classes of persons united, formed this party in that covenant, and were therefore together members of God's church. If Abram had refused infants a standing in the covenant, if he had declined to apply its seal to them; he would have refused the covenant of his God, as truly as if he had refused to apply its seal to adults. God made infants a portion of one party in this covenant, a portion of "his people," of his flock, of the members of his church when it was first organized. He and he alone had a right to receive them as members into his church, and he alone has a right to exclude them from membership. To receive or to exclude them is alike God's prerogative, not man's. God in his wisdom received infants into his church, into covenant relation with himself, and required its seal to be applied to them. He and he alone has a right to exclude them. And since he has not excluded them; they still retain to him the same relation which they did when this covenant relation was formed. They have the same standing in the visible church which God gave them when it was organized. He has not excluded them from it; men have no right to do so. They are therefore yet a portion of its members. (2.) *Infants are mentioned as members of his visible church.* They are often spoken of as church members in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Our Saviour says of "infants," of "young children," of "little children," whom "he took—up in his arms;"—"of such is the kingdom of heaven,"—"of God."* That the expression "kingdom of God" or "of heaven," denotes the visible church and especially the visible church in New Testament times, is often and very plainly taught in the word of God (*a*).† When our Saviour says of any class of persons; "of such is the kingdom of God," the expression cannot signify less than that these persons constitute a portion of the members of which it is composed. This kingdom could not be that of glory; for those infants of which it was composed, were yet living on earth when "Christ took them up in his arms." They could not have been a portion of those who were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and stran-

*Mat. 19: 13. 14. 15, Mark 10: 13–16. Luke 18: 15. 16. (*a*) See B. i. P. iii, Ch. 1. § 2, par. 2. †Mat. 3: 2 and 4: 17 and 10: 7 and 25: 1, Luke 12: 31 and 22: 18, Acts 19: 8. &c.

gers from the covenants of promise,"* for then they would not have been portions or members of the visible "kingdom of God." Our Saviour therefore, instead of excluding infants from the visible church, actually and expressly recognized their standing in that church (3.) *He mentions them as pattern members of the New Testament church which is his visible kingdom on earth.* He does this when he says to his disciples; "Except ye—become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;"—"whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child,—shall not enter therein."† Little children are here presented as pattern members of this kingdom. To be like a little child is what renders an adult a proper member of this kingdom. But if to be *like* a little child, renders an adult a suitable member of this kingdom; to be *actually* a little child, will not make a person a less suitable member of it. Little children therefore are manifestly pattern members of this kingdom. But this kingdom is the visible church in New Testament times. The eleven disciples had not yet entered this kingdom. Before this they were true believers and followers of Christ. Being believers, they were justified by faith and were therefore prepared, when the Lord should call, to enter the kingdom of glory. That before this they were true believers, is clear from the declaration so often made that they had a "little faith."‡ That this kingdom was not the visible church in Old Testament times, or during that dispensation of the covenant which ended at the moment Christ said "it is finished," is manifest from the fact that when our Saviour thus addressed them; they were, and for some time after, they remained members of that church(*a*). This kingdom which they could not enter unless they became as little children, must therefore have been the visible church in New Testament times. The Lord Jesus Christ then presents "little children,"—"infants,"—such as he took "up in his arms," not only as members but even as pattern members of his visible church in New Testament times. (4.) "Children" and "little children" are often by inspired men addressed as New Testament church members. In the epistle addressed to "the churches" in "Galatia," the spirit of God in-

*Mark 10: 16, Eph. 2: 12. †Mat. 18: 3, Mark 10: 15, Luke 18: 17. ‡See Mat. 6: 30 and 8: 26 and 14: 31 and 16: 8, Rom. 5: 1. 2 and 8: 1, &c. (*a*) See B. i, P. iii, Ch. 1, § 2.

spired the apostle Paul to single out and address the infant members. He, like a faithful under-shepherd, addressed the lambs of the flock in this endearing language; "My little children."* The apostle John, in one very short epistle addressed to the churches in general, divides those to whom he wrote into three classes,—"fathers,"—"young men," and "little children."† These "little children" are expressly mentioned as church members. The "fathers" and "young men" are not more definitely expressed than they are. Indeed, these infant members are no less than *nine times*, in this one short epistle, specially and expressly mentioned by the appellation of "little children."‡ When God, by his servants, so repeatedly addresses "little children" as church members in New Testament times; no person who truly believes his word, can hesitate to acknowledge them as such. Little children, infants, are therefore expressly mentioned as church members both in Old and New Testament times.

9. *God provided for the continuation and increase of the members of his church.* This he did in a two-fold way. (1.) The children of those in covenant were to be its members from their earliest infancy. This truth is expressly taught in the word of God. Abram's "seed after" him are commanded to keep God's covenant. They were, in infancy, to receive its seal, because they were in covenant with God.§ "Children—that suck the breasts," are mentioned as a part of the "congregation" of the Lord, more than a thousand years after this covenant engagement was first made.‖ In New Testament times they are very frequently mentioned as composing a part, if not a principal part of God's visible kingdom on earth(*a*). One way therefore by which the visible church was to be perpetuated from its organization onward through time, was by taking the infant seed of the members of this church into covenant relation with God. (2.) Persons who, before were not in covenant, were, both in Old and New Testament times, to be received, with their families or households, into covenant with God. This is expressly taught both in the Old and New Testament. "When a stranger—will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his

*Gal. 1: 2 and 4: 19. †1 John 2: 13. 14. ‡See 1 John 2: 1. 12. 13. 18. 28 and 3: 7. 18 and 4: 4 and 5: 21. §Gen. 17: 7. 8–14. ‖Joel 2: 16. (*a*)See § 8.

males be circumcised ;"—"one law shall be to him that is home-born and unto the stranger."* Those who were before "strangers from the covenants of promise," might be received into covenant ; but all their males must be circumcised. They must conform to the same law which the native Israelite was bound to obey. This required the seal of the covenant to be applied to infants as well as to adults. In the New Testament, we are definitely informed that parents and their children, or adults and their households, were received into this visible church. As instances of parents and their children, families or households, being received into the church, "Lydia" and "her household," the jailer and his "house," &c., may be mentioned(*a*).† Here are heads of families and their households admitted together into the church of God in New Testament times. Indeed, there is not, on record, a single instance, either in Old or New Testament times, of a parent being admitted into the church from the world, and his children excluded from or suffered to remain out of the covenant. From what has been here stated, it is clear, that parents who were before strangers to the covenant, might, with their children, be received into the church. But there is not the least intimation given, in the whole word of God, that parents may be received into covenant, and their children excluded or suffered to remain among the professed enemies of God. Those parents therefore who will not bring their children with them into covenant relation with God, have no scriptural right to enter themselves into that relation.

The church is God's visible kingdom on earth. In all kingdoms, citizenship by birth is at least as valid as that by naturalization. To exclude infants, born under any government from the right of citizenship, or the protection of the laws, so far as they could enjoy the one or needed the other, would be perfect folly and unmitigated cruelty. To say that all natural born citizens must be put on a par with foreigners, and like them be naturalized before they can enjoy the privilege of citizens, would be very unwise in any government. But the God of perfect wisdom has adopted in the church which is his visible kingdom, no such law as would brand with folly any of the potentates of the earth. He has

*Ex. 12: 48. 49, Num. 9: 14. (*a*)See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 6. †See Acts 16: 14. 15. 31. 33.

not said to the children of his visible subjects; ye are "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel." Let men beware how they invade God's prerogative in this matter!! He knows who are proper subjects of his kingdom; suitable members of his church, at least as well as man.

10. *This church has a seal by which the promise of the covenant is confirmed.* The seal of the covenant, in Old Testament times, was circumcision. This is called "the token of the covenant;"—"the sign of circumcision;" and "a seal of the righteousness of—faith."* That circumcision was a token or seal of the covenant, and that spiritual as well as temporal blessings, were promised in it, are facts too plainly taught by the language of inspiration to be denied without leaning far towards infidelity. That baptism is the seal of the covenant in New Testament times, has already been shown(*a*). There is now a visible church. This is a fact known and admitted by all professing christians. A church supposes a covenant, and a covenant supposes a seal. Those persons who were added to the church were baptized. They first entered or were received into this visible covenant with God and then its seal was applied to them.† That circumcision, as a seal of the covenant, was discontinued and became "nothing," and that baptism is required as an ordinance in the New Testament church, are facts abundantly proved from the word of God.‡ It is also manifest that none were without baptism admitted to church fellowship after the death of Christ(*b*). Baptism is therefore the seal of the covenant, which must be applied to all church members in New Testament times.

11. *Commemorative ordinances belong to the visible church.* The passover was the commemorative ordinance in Old Testament times. It commemorates the deliverance of Israel out of Egyptian bondage.§ It also confirmed other blessings. But it was not the seal of the covenant. That was made and sealed more than four hundred years before the Israelites left Egypt.‖ It could not therefore be sealed by the passover. It had been long before sealed by circumcision. The

*Gen. 17: 11, Rom. 4: 11. *(a)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11. †See Acts 2: 41. 47, and many other passages. ‡See Acts 15: 1. 5. 10. 20. 28. 29, 1 Cor. 7: 19, Gal. 3: 17, Mat. 28: 19, Acts 2: 41 and 8: 12 and 10: 47. 48., &c. *(b)* See B. i, P. iii, Ch. 3, § 8; B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 1-3. 9. 11. §See Ex. 12: 11. 14. ‖See Ex. 12: 40, Gal. 3: 17.

Lord's supper is a commemorative ordinance in New Testament times. It commemorates the death of Christ.* This also seals spiritual blessings, but not the covenant; because it was instituted before the death of Christ, while circumcision continued in force as the seal of the covenant.† The passover and the Lord's supper are therefore commemorative ordinances which seal blessings, but do not seal the covenant. Persons formerly eat the passover, and at present partake of the holy supper; because they were or are members of the visible church; because they are in covenant with God and have received its seal; not to make them church members or to be to them a seal of the covenant.

12. *God's organization of a visible church is the very best of which man can form a conception.* Believing parents and their children composed its members at first. They do so still. This organization throws the restraints of God's covenant as well as those of his law around children who are baptized. The parents too were and are thus bound in covenant as well as by the law and natural affection to "train up" their children "in the way" they "should go."‡ If thus trained up, we have the Divine promise, that when they are old, they "will not depart from" that way. This organization secures more true scriptural piety, more scriptural knowledge, more morality, more conformity to the word of God in every respect, than any other organization ever yet attempted by man.

13. *All attempts to organize a visible church composed only of true believers, are absurd.* No such a visible church has ever existed. The church in Old Testament times, had in it unconverted members. In apostolic times, the church had its "Ananias" and "Sapphira;" its "Simon;" its "Hymeneus and Philetus," and others who had no true interest in the Lord Jesus Christ.§ Indeed, to organize a church composed only of true believers, would require a constant miracle by which men might be taught supernaturally, who were and who were not truly converted. The visible church can only be composed of professed believers either with or without their children. For uninspired men then to imagine that they could form a more pure church than that

*See 1 Cor. 11: 23–26. †See Luke 22: 15–20. ‡Prov. 22: 6. §Acts 5: 1. 3. 7–10 and 8: 13. 21, 2 Tim. 2: 17. 18, Rev. 2: 14. 15. 20.

which existed in apostolic times and which was under the direction of inspired men, is truly absurd. A visible church composed only of true believers, is not mentioned in the scriptures; nor has such a church ever existed on earth. It may also be remarked here, as a general truth, that those denominations of professing christians who make the most noise on this subject, have usually if not universally, the least amount of true scriptural piety among their members. But a very small proportion of them, it will be found upon a careful examination, are anxious to go "to the law and to the testimony" and to that only, as their guide in all religious duties. They are usually too "wise in their own conceits" to be directed in all things by the wisdom of God. If, among the twelve apostles of Christ, one Judas who was "a thief" and a "devil," was found; how superlatively absurd must be the self-importance of those who talk of a visible church on earth composed only of true believers!!

14. *Discipline must be exercised in the visible church or it will soon become corrupt.* In Old Testament times, those who violated any part of the ceremonial law, or neglected circumcision or the passover, were to be "cut off from" God's "people."* Those who violated the moral law were to be put to death, or punished in some other way which supposed excommunication from visible covenant relation with God and his people.† "Sinners" or immoral persons were not to be allowed a standing "in the congregation of the righteous."‡ Neglect of discipline in the Old Testament church opened the door for all manner of wickedness. This wickedness of the Jews became so great in the days of Christ's ministry on earth, that they eventually crucified him. In New Testament times, none from the world are to be admitted into the visible church till they give good evidence that they are true christians.§ To do this they must receive with love what God teaches in his word and practice what he commands in the scriptures. No immoral persons nor such as reject any part of God's truth are allowed by the king of Zion to enter or remain in his visible church. All such should be suspended from sealing ordinances.‖ By the

*Gen. 17: 14, Ex. 12: 15, Lev. 7: 27. †See Ex. 31: 14, Num. 15: 30. 32. 35; See also Lev. 10: 1–3 and 26: 14–39, Num. 35: 29–33, Deut. 13: 6–11, &c. ‡Ps. 1: 5. §See Acts 8: 12. 37 and 10: 47, &c. ‖See 1 Cor. 5: 1. 5 and 6: 8–11, Gal. 5: 19–21, 2 Tim. 3: 1–5, Tit. 3: 10.

neglect of discipline among professing christians, large portions of the once christian church, have become antichristian. Church discipline is therefore indispensable to the purity of Christ's kingdom on earth.

15. *The New Testament church is five-fold.* It is *true, formal, false, nominal or antichristian.* (1.) The *true* christian church believes and practices all that God in his word requires of persons during the dispensation under which they live. These church members do not receive or practice for religion either more or less than what he commands. They learn from God's word what he teaches. With this they are satisfied. In the scriptures they find just what pleases them; nor do they find any thing in those holy writings which they desire to explain away or reject. The word of God as it is, exactly suits them in every particular. To conform to this, they are satisfied, is their wisdom as well as their duty. That they comply so imperfectly with its requirements, is to them, a cause of grief; but this does not lead them to wish to make alterations in God's word.* (2.) A *formal* church is one which, in mere profession and external actions, complies with what God teaches in his word. But in general the members of a *formal* church, have no true love for God's truth or for his requirements.† (3.) A *false* church adopts either more or less than God requires in his word. Many, if not all, its members choose, in some things which they call religion, to follow the directions of men rather than to receive and practice just what God requires.‡ (4.) A *nominal* church is one that takes the christian name without even professing to take the word of God as their only rule of duty in all their religious principles and practices.§ (5.) An *antichristian* church is one which rejects God's truth in some of its parts. In it the whole gospel cannot be preached. Ministers and christians who will believe and practice as religion, neither more nor less than what God teaches in his word, will not be allowed to remain in it; or its members and rulers will continually disturb their peace while they live in exact accordance with God's holy

*See Deut. 6: 6–8, Isa. 8: 20, Mat. 5: 16 and 28: 20, John 5: 39 and 6: 29 and 15: 14, 2 Thess. 3: 14, 1 Tim. 6: 3. 4, 2 Tim. 3: 15–17. †See Rom. 2: 20, 2 Tim. 3: 5. ‡See Mat. 15: 3. 9, Col. 2: 22. 23, Heb. 13: 9, 2 Pet. 2: 21, Rev. 2: 9 and 3: 9. 11. §See Mat. 15: 8, Rev. 3: 1.

truth. This is, in principle, a persecuting church.* Belonging to each of these five parts, there are or may be different denominations. It is the duty of every person to be or become a member of some branch of the true church(*a*).

16. *Those who turn aside in religious matters from the word of God are guilty of the sin of division.* Every person who becomes connected with the church, thereby pledges himself to serve God according to his word. If he does either more or less as a part of his religious duties than God requires in the scriptures, he becomes thereby a covenant-breaker. If others join with him, they become guilty of the same sin. Whether many or few, a large or small proportion of the members of the true church, thus turn aside, in doctrine or in practice, or in both, from the word of God; they are guilty of producing division. Those who adhere to the scriptures in principle and in practice, are not guilty of this sin. Those who separate from God's word as their only rule in religious duties, often profess much anxiety for union. But they ought to know that all such professions amount to nothing, while they believe and practice for religion either more or less than what God's word requires. They are, while they do not conform entirely to the scriptures as their only rule in all religious duties, living habitually in the commission of the sin of separating from God's word. All who join them while they remain in such a sinful course, unite with them in sin. It ought always to be remembered therefore that it is not the man who adheres to God's truth as his only rule in all religious duties, but the man who separates from it, who is guilty of the sin of schism.

*See John 16: 2, 2 Thess. 2: 3–12, 1 Tim. 4: 1–3, 2 Tim. 4: 3. 4, 1 John 2: 18. 22 and 4: 3, 2 John 7.

(a) Those who join any church which professes to be christian, solemnly declare before God and the world, by the act of uniting with such church, that the religious principles and practices of the body with which they thus unite, express their views of scriptural truth. While they continue united with any professedly christian church, they habitually make the same declaration If therefore, the religious doctrines and practices of the church to which any person belongs do not express his views of scriptural truth, he is living in the sin of habitual falsehood. His falsehood too is of the most aggravated kind. It is nothing less than most solemnly declaring, by his habitual conduct, that he believes what he does not believe. This is one crying sin of professing christians in this day of increasing depravity. This God-provoking sin often calls itself—liberality or charity. Every church, as well as every individual, is bound to adopt for religion neither more nor less than what God requires in his word. Those who do either, are insulting the king of Zion, by "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." This their "will-worship," they cannot palm upon God for acceptable service.

17. *The visible church has a ministry.* In Old Testament times, its ministry was composed of heads of families, prophets, priests and Levites. These discharged their respective duties by obeying the commandments of God. In executing the duties of their stations, they offered gifts and sacrifices according to his appointment. They also taught the people.* In New Testament times, the visible church has a ministry composed of persons each of whom (if he is a true servant of Christ,) sustains the office of an ambassador of the Prince of Peace. This is not the apostolic, but the ministerial office which Christ gave to the eleven and to their successors(*a*). Those to whom the Lord Jesus Christ intrusts this office, are qualified by the regenerating grace of the Spirit, by a desire to serve God in the work of the ministry, by a capability of teaching in a good degree whatever Christ has commanded in his word, and then they must receive the office of an ambassador "for Christ" from those who are properly authorized to transfer it to others.† Those who hold the office of the ministry and are therefore authorized to preach the gospel and administer New Testament ordinances, and they only, can ordain or set persons apart to the office of the christian ministry.‡ The ministers of Christ all have the same commission. This requires the same essential qualifications in each minister. It demands the same essential duties of all and each of them.† That thing called a Diocesan bishop, is not mentioned in the word of God, unless it is included "in the man of sin—the son of perdition." Besides, the idea that the same commission (and there is but one given to the eleven and their true successors,) should confer two distinct offices, the one, that of a Diocesan bishop, the other, that of a minister of Christ, is a perfect absurdity.

The succession of ministers, not of Diocesan bishops, may easily be traced from the apostles down to the present time. Before the year 100, the apostles had planted churches in Syria, in Asia Minor, and in Italy. They had ordained a number of faithful men to the ministry. From the year 100 till 200, many churches planted by these faithful men, ex-

*Gen. 4: 3. 4 and 8: 20 and 12: 7 and 20: 7 and 35: 1, Ex. 40: 13, Num. 8: 6. 7. 11, Mal. 2: 7. (*a*) See B. i. P. iv, Ch. 1, § 5. †Mat. 28: 20, 2 Cor. 5: 20, 1 Tim. 3: 1–7 and 4: 14, 2 Tim. 2: 2, Tit. 1: 5–11. ‡See Heb. 5: 1–4.

isted in the north of Italy and in the south of France. These ministers and their successors, continued to preach, establish churches and ordain other faithful men to the ministerial office, till the reformation commenced. Then the true church which had existed all through "the dark ages" under different names given them in different ages and countries, such as Waldenses, Albigenses, Lionists, Paulicians, Hussites, Lollards, Wickliffites, &c., became one with the reformed. By these the ordination of the reformers was acknowledged and thus confirmed. Lax discipline and human inventions began to be introduced into other parts of the church about the year 248. About the year 300 the last persecution by the heathen ended. A system which eventually terminated in Diocesan Episcopacy, was introduced into several large churches by Constantine about the year 320. But the true church still retained the apostolic principles and practices. It retained the Presbyterian form of government taught in the word of God, and it uniformly rejected the domineering claims of Diocesan Episcopacy. For doing this, its members suffered many long and severe persecutions. Many congregations of these true christians were found in France, Italy, Germany, England, &c., during every part of the dark ages. About the year 560, the Syrian christians were driven by persecution from their own country to the north of Italy. These became united with the Lionists about the year 590. The enemies of the true church, while they were persecuting the people of God, destroyed most of their ecclesiastical records. But enough remains to show that their principles, their practices and ordination were apostolical(*a*).* Those persons who are intrusted with the ministerial office, and those only, have a right to administer the ordinance of christian baptism(*b*), or perform any of its other peculiar functions. Wicked or ignorant men may hold the external office of the gospel ministry ; but they are mere wolves in sheep's clothing. They are ambassadors for Christ only in mere externals. They have no heart for his service, no love for his cause, or they would not enter the ministry without the qualifications which are essentially necessary in

(*a*) See Dr. Allix's Remarks, Adam Blair's History of the Waldenses, &c. *See Acts 11: 26, Rom. 1: 15, Rev. 1: 4. 11. (*b*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 5.

one who is to teach, both by precept and example, what our Saviour has revealed in the scriptures of truth.*

18. *Those who have no interest in the covenant made with Abram and his seed, are not members of the visible church.* God has organized no other church, but that which he formed in the days of Abram. He has formed no other visible covenant relation with his professed people, but that which was entered into with Abram and with his literal and spiritual seed. This covenant was confirmed in Christ. It was to be everlasting. That church has not been disorganized. That covenant has not been disannulled. Though its seal has been changed, yet the covenant remains in full force. By rejecting this covenant, men refuse to receive an interest in the only visible church which God has ever organized on earth. By turning away from this, they slight the covenanted mercies of God(*a*). As therefore there is not now and never has been, any other visible church organized on earth, but that which God formed in the days of Abram; so those who are not members of some branch of that church cannot be members of any. They may form human associations; but these are not Divinely organized churches(*b*). Men ought to make a solemn pause before they, for any consideration whatever, reject or turn aside from the covenant of God, and set at naught his grace in organizing a visible church among our guilty race.

19. *The privileges of the visible church are extended in New Testament times.* This may be observed in several particulars. (1.) Since the death of Christ, the seal of the covenant has been actually extended to females. Before this it was virtually theirs, in consequence of their relation to the males. (2.) Infants of parents, only one of whom is in covenant, are entitled now to its seal.† (3.) Its blessings are offered to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. (4.) All its members are freed from the bondage of the ceremonial law. (5.) Its ministers may now be taken from any family. (6.) It has a greater amount of written revelation. In these and other respects the privileges of the visible church are extended. But in no instance is any privilege, in New Testament times, taken away from the church.

*See Mat. 28: 19. 20, 2 Tim. 2: 2. (*a*) See § 1-9. (*b*) See § 1. †See 1 Cor. 7: 14.

Not the least evidence is found in the whole word of God, to show that the privileges of the New Testament church are to be less in any respect than those of the Old. It cannot be supposed then that infants who, when the covenant was first made and during its whole Old Testament dispensation, constituted more than one half of one of the parties in it, should, in New Testament times, be excluded from it and from the use of its seal. God has not told us, in any form of words, that he has excluded infants from their standing in the covenant. He has not taken this privilege from them or from their parents. God received the infant with the parent into covenant relation with himself. In many respects he has extended the privileges of the church in New Testament times. He has not diminished these, nor taken them from infants. That he has done either, is unsupported by any evidence, and is not therefore to be believed by intelligent men.

20. *In the organization of the visible church, baptism with water is included as the seal of the covenant in New Testament times.* This will appear by presenting the principal parts of this subject before the mind at once. (1.) The visible church was organized in the days of Abram. (2.) Its members were adults and infants. (3.) Circumcision, when the covenant was first made, was its seal. (4.) It was to be applied to infants whose parents were in covenant. (5.) God has not excluded infants from the church or from a right to the seal of the covenant. (6.) In New Testament times, baptism is the seal of this covenant. (7.) If one parent is in covenant, so are the children.* (8.) Adopted children are in covenant and therefore have a right to its seal.†(*a*). It appears therefore that the very organization of the visible church included the application of water to infants in the ordinance of christian baptism ; because the seal of the covenant, whatever it is, belongs to infants. That seal is now baptism ; therefore they are to receive that ordinance ; for it is now the seal of the covenant.

*See 1 Cor. 7: 14. †See Gen. 17: 12. 13. 27. *(a)* See § 2-5. 8. 10. 17.

PART SECOND.

WHAT MAY NOT, AND WHAT MAY BE BAPTIZED.

CHAPTER I.

NOT THINGS, BUT PERSONS ARE TO BE BAPTIZED.

1. *An inanimate substance cannot receive the ordinance of christian baptism.* This appears, (1.) From the fact that when the Lord Jesus Christ commissioned men to administer christian baptism, he did not authorize them to baptize inanimate matter. In this commission, he directs men to teach "all nations, baptizing them;"* but in it he gives no authority for baptizing mere material substances. Men therefore have no right to do so. (2.) It is not so much as intimated in the word of God, that inspired men, at any time, administered this ordinance to things. There is therefore no authority from example for baptizing material substances or mere things. (3.) These substances are, in their nature, incapable of receiving what is signified in christian baptism; and they therefore cannot receive that ordinance(*a*). As there is no authority in the word of God for baptizing bells, buildings, &c., so no person has a right to apply water to them in the name of the Trinity. As they are totally incapable of receiving what is signified in the ordinance, so to attempt to baptize them, is only a solemn farce over which christianity weeps, and from which common sense turns away with disgust.

Under the Old Testament dispensation of the church, things, as well as persons, were to be ceremonially purified. These ceremonial "washings" are, by the Spirit of God, called (βαπτισμοις) baptisms.† Divine wisdom informs us, in more than twenty passages of scripture, that these baptisms were, by the authority of God, performed by sprinkling(*b*). Moreover, it is said of the Jews, that after "they come from market, except they wash" (βαπτισωνται) or baptize, "they eat not;" "and many other things—they hold—as the washing" (βαπτισμους) or baptizing "of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables(*c*).‡ But for this they had no Divine authority. Nor has any person any Divine author-

*Mat. 28: 19. *(a)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. †Heb. 9: 10 in Greek. *(b)* See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 1, § 3. 7. ‡Mark 7: 4 in Greek. *(c)* See B. i, P. vi, Ch. 1, § 2.

ity for baptizing, in New Testament times, any inanimate substance. To attempt to do so, is only solemn trifling.

2. *Animals cannot receive the christian ordinance of baptism.* No authority is given to men by our Saviour to administer the ordinance of baptism to animals any more than to inanimate matter. Nor are we informed in the scriptures that inspired men ever baptized a single animal. Moreover, animals cannot receive what is signified in that holy ordinance, any more than inanimate matter can(*a*). Animals therefore cannot be baptized. To attempt to baptize them is to insult Zion's King.

3. *Human beings and they only can receive christian baptism.* To sustain this position many arguments may be presented. (1.) To them, and only to them, the Lord Jesus Christ requires the ordinance to be administered. He directs his ministering servants to "teach all nations, baptizing them." (2.) In obedience to this command, his inspired servants baptized "both men and women."* These and many other portions of God's word, teach that human beings alone were to be, and were baptized by Divine authority. They alone are capable of receiving what is signified in christian baptism(*a*). They only can have the blood of Christ applied to them by the holy Spirit in his converting and sanctifying influences. To them only can the sign of this work of grace be therefore applied with propriety. Human beings therefore and no others, can receive christian baptism which signifies the work of the Spirit on the soul. To receive what is signified in this ordinance is not inconsistent with their nature. They may therefore be baptized. To receive what christian baptism signifies is totally inconsistent with the nature of all other creatures. These others therefore cannot receive christian baptism. It follows then that human beings, and they only, can receive the ordinance of christian baptism.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS NOT AND WHAT IS, IN THE SUBJECT, ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM.

1. *To render the ordinance of baptism valid, it is not necessary that its subject should be a true christian.* Many per-

(*a*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. *Acts 8: 12.

sons are, in the word of God, mentioned as baptized church members, who were nevertheless entirely destitute of vital godliness. Persons who are publicly recognized as church members must have been baptized; because by baptism that public recognition is first made. But church members at Sardis, at Laodicea, and at other places, who, because they were publicly acknowledged as such, must have been baptized, had, notwithstanding their membership, only "a name" to live while they were, in reality, "wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked."* Such also were Ananias and Sapphira, who lied unto "the Holy Ghost."† Though these were baptized church members, yet they were manifestly destitute of an interest in the Lord Jesus Christ. Many other instances are on record in the scriptures, of persons who, in a state of unbelief, were publicly recognized as baptized church members. As a specimen of these, Simon, the Samaritan sorcerer may be noticed. In his case, we may learn what things are not, in the subject, necessary to the valid existence of christian baptism. From the account given of him,‡ it is evident that *before*, *at* and *after* his baptism he was a hardened sinner. (1.) He was and had been for years, by profession, a sorcerer or public deceiver. (2.) He was an unbelieving, impenitent, unconverted, unholy man. (3.) He had no spiritual knowledge or perception of Divine things. (4.) He was "a natural man," who did not, and could not, in that state, receive or know "the things of the Spirit of God."§ (5.) He had no "part" or "lot" in the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. (6.) He was, *at* and *after* his baptism, still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." But notwithstanding all this, Simon "was baptized." To the existence then of the ordinance of christian baptism, it is not necessary that the person baptized, should believe or repent, or be regenerated, or be converted, or be holy, or have spiritual knowledge of the nature of baptism, or of any other ordinance, or have a personal interest in Christ; because Simon was destitute of all these spiritual graces and affections, and yet he "was baptized." Besides all his other sins, he professed to be a true believer in Christ; while he imagined that "the gift of

*Rev. 3: 1. 15–17. †Acts 5: 1–3. ‡See Acts 8: 8–13. 18–24. §1 Cor. 2: 14.

God" might "be purchased with money." In making this profession, he was guilty of uttering a positive falsehood, either because he was self-deceived, or because he wished to deceive others. Though both in words and in the very act of receiving christian baptism, he was guilty of all this sin; still it is declared, he "was baptized." All this wickedness did not render it impossible for him to be baptized. It did not invalidate this ordinance. Notwithstanding all this, his baptism was valid. True religion in the subject is not therefore necessary to the validity of christian baptism; for Simon, who was not a true christian, but a very wicked man, "was baptized."

2. *If true faith was essential to christian baptism, man could not administer that ordinance.* To "search the heart"* is a Divine prerogative. God alone can see into the soul of man. He can determine whether true faith exists there or not. A minister of Christ, however faithful, intelligent and pious, cannot "search the heart." He may be deceived as to the real piety, the true faith, of any person who may desire to receive any ordinance of the christian church. If true faith was indispensable to the validity of baptism; the minister could not, in any case, certainly tell, whether he was engaged in administering a solemn christian ordinance, or performing an act of mere mockery. Besides, the ministerial commission requires those to whom it is intrusted, to teach and baptize; but it does not direct them to search the heart or work miracles. It is evident therefore, that since mere men are empowered to baptize; true faith, the existence of which in the subject they cannot at any time certainly determine, is not essential to the validity of the ordinance.

3. *No class of men really hold that true faith in the subject is essential to valid baptism.* Those who adopt the antichristian fancy that baptism is regeneration(*a*), and therefore maintain that faith is communicated in the very act of administering this ordinance, do not, of course, say that the person baptized had this faith before its administration commenced. Those who assert that mankind are born holy, cannot suppose that, if any of them, are baptized before they

*Jer. 17: 10, Rev. 2: 23. *(a)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 16.

sin, they can have faith conferred upon them either at or before their baptism; because true christian faith, as one of its exercises, leads those who possess it to trust in Christ to save their souls from the guilt of sin. Those who are perfectly holy, or are totally free from sin before they receive baptism, cannot need this true christian faith. Some persons however, by their professions, would lead the unwary to suppose that they hold to what they call believer's baptism. They thus intimate that true faith must invariably precede valid baptism. A person unacquainted with their practice would suppose, from their language, that they never admitted any baptism to be valid unless the subject of it was a true believer before he received the ordinance. But instead of this, they seldom or never require, from those whom they immerse, such an amount of scriptural evidence of the existence of true faith in their soul, as would convince an intelligent christian that they, even in profession, really believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. The immersed frequently prove by their actions, that, like Simon the sorcerer, they are yet in a state of unbelief(*a*). Their habitual conduct often shows that they always lived "without God in the world."* If however, such persons should, after their immersion, be truly converted to God and to a love of his truth, by the power of his Spirit; immersers would not re-immerse them. Thus they prove by their actions in relation to this matter, that they do not really hold to the notion that true faith is essential to valid baptism. They hold that those who are not true believers, may be baptized. This they prove by their practice, however differently they often talk.

Indeed, so far as scriptural evidence of regeneration is concerned, the baptized among Pedobaptist christians give altogether better evidence of having experienced the renewing grace of God's spirit, than the immersed do. This can be easily illustrated by the example of any of those Pedobaptists who actually take the word of God for their only rule of duty, and who therefore train up their children in the way they "should go."

4. *Certain things in the subject are essential to the very existence of christian baptism.* These may be known by

(*a*) See § 1. *Eph. 2: 12.

him who administers the ordinance. If they could not, he could never be certain that the person to whom he applied water, was really baptized. These are few and very plain. (1.) The subject of christian baptism must be a human being(*a*). None but human beings can be baptized. Men have no authority to administer this ordinance to any but to human beings. (2.) The subject of christian baptism must be a sinful creature. None but sinful creatures can be regenerated, converted, or have the blood of Christ applied to their souls. No others therefore can receive what is signified in christian baptism(*b*). Hence to any others, the ordinance would be a mere unmeaning ceremony. (3.) In his nature, the subject of baptism must be capable, at the time, or before, or after it is administered, of receiving what is signified in the ordinance. (4.) He must be received into that covenant of which baptism is a seal. This must be done at the time or before the ordinance is administered. And, as some are called covenant-breakers to whom its seal was not applied, and because it was not applied to them;* so a person must be acknowledged to be in covenant at least the instant before the seal is applied to him(*c*). It will be evident to those who examine this matter carefully, that these four things and no more are really necessary to the very existence of christian baptism. They will see that men are authorized by our Saviour to administer christian baptism to human beings and no other creatures; that only sinful creatures, and not the perfectly holy, can receive this ordinance; that the baptized must, in their nature, be capable of receiving what is signified in christian baptism, and that those to whom it is administered must be in the covenant which God entered into with his professed people.

If it is affirmed that infants cannot enter into covenant relation with God; it may be answered that Divine wisdom teaches that they can. God has received them into covenant with himself. He certainly knows who are proper persons to form that relation. He has long since received infants into covenant with himself. Men have no right to exclude them. God has received them.† What man is so foolhardy as to usurp the Divine prerogative of excluding them from

(*a*) See Ch. 1, § 3. (*b*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. *See Gen. 17: 14. (*a*) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 6. †See Gen. 17: 7-17.

an interest in God's covenant? He who does so, claims the right of dictating to his Maker. He declares, by such an act, that he can reform the covenant which Omniscience has made. He thus more than intimates that though God has, long since, received infants into this covenant with himself, as a portion of one of its parties; yet he, a mere man, will, in the plenitude of his wisdom, exclude them from it and from the use of its seal. From such an act, what intelligent christian will not shrink?

CHAPTER III.

ADULTS ARE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

1. *True believers are proper subjects of baptism.* Though true faith is not essential to the existence of christian baptism(*a*), yet every true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ has a right to be baptized. This appears from many plain declarations of scripture. "The people of Samaria"—"believed—and—were baptized;"—Philip said to the Eunuch, "if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest" be baptized; the Philippian jailer "believed—and was baptized;" "Crispus"—with "many of the Corinthians—believed and were baptized."* These and many similar passages of scripture show that true believers ought to be baptized.

In the declaration; "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,"† we are taught that the true believer shall be saved. The baptism here mentioned is represented as existing at the same time with true faith. The believer *is* baptized; not he *shall* or *will be* baptized. This baptism is represented as being administered either at the moment the person believes or before. As this, together with faith, appears to be inseparably connected with salvation, so it is more than probable that spiritual baptism or regeneration is here intended. This kind of baptism always takes place the instant true faith is produced in the soul. Every true believer is therefore baptized with this spiritual baptism. But if baptism with water is intended; then, as it is represented as actually existing the moment the person believes; so it must have been administered before true faith was produced in the soul; because baptism with water cannot be administered in

(*a*) See Ch. 2, § 1-3. *Acts 8: 9. 12. 36. 37 and 16: 31. 33 and 19: 8. †Mark 16: 16.

an indivisible point of time. But if the declaration was, (as it is frequently though very incorrectly represented,) believe and be baptized; it would simply prove that true believers ought to be baptized. This is a truth often taught in other passages of scripture, and which no believer in baptism with water ever pretends to deny. All such maintain that true believers ought to be baptized, if the ordinance had not, before they believed, been administered to them.

Moreover, if the argument which immersers attempt to fabricate from this passage, be examined; it will exclude from salvation, every infant which it would exclude from baptism. The exclusives say(*a*), faith must precede baptism; infants cannot believe; therefore infants cannot be baptized. By the same kind of logic, infants must be excluded from salvation. They might say with equal or even with greater propriety; faith must precede salvation; infants cannot believe; therefore infants cannot be saved. But God does not say that faith must precede baptism; and the spirit of God, by his new-creating power, can produce the principle or grace of faith in the soul of an infant, as easily as he produced it in that of Saul of Tarsus.* That sophistry must be worse than useless which can, with equal ease, exclude infants from baptism and from eternal felicity.

2. *Those who have received spiritual baptism or have been truly regenerated, are to be baptized with water.* (1.) These are always true believers(*b*). To believe and to be spiritually baptized or regenerated, are only different expressions to denote different parts of the same change. When therefore this change is described by one word which indicates that the person is entitled to water baptism; his right to it is as clearly proved as when for this purpose, a different word is used. The believer may be baptized. Those who are spiritually baptized, are believers; therefore these, being true believers, are to be baptized with water. (2.) Peter asks, "can any man forbid water that" Cornelius and his friends, "should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"—"and he commanded them to be baptized."† The very reason given to show that these persons ought to be baptized with water, is; they had been

(*a*) But God does not, nor do they practice on this principle. *See Acts 9: 1. 5. 6. 13. 17. 20. (*b*) See § 1. †Acts. 10: 24. 47. 48.

baptized with the Holy Ghost, or had been regenerated. It is certain therefore that those who have been spiritually baptized ought to receive the ordinance of christian baptism.

3. *Those who truly repent are to be baptized.* Faith and repentance do not exist seperately in the same person. He who is truly regenerated by the power of the Holy Spirit, at the very same instant receives into his soul the principles of true faith and true repentance. These principles are active. They manifest themselves in the life of those who receive them. The true penitent therefore, because he is a true believer, may and ought to be baptized(*a*). That those who exercise evangelical repentance ought to be baptized, is also taught in the command; "repent and be baptized every one of you."* This language clearly intimates that every one who truly repents, is in duty bound, if he had not before been baptized, to receive the ordinance of christian baptism.

4. *Professed believers are proper subjects of baptism.* A personal profession of faith in Christ, is not in the scriptures represented as essential to the existence of the ordinance of christian baptism. To make such a profession, while the heart is not right with God, is an act of egregious wickedness. But notwithstanding all this, those who "profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him," have a right to be baptized. Those who, in profession, believe in Christ, professedly believe what he teaches in his word; and they actually, in external matters, obey all his holy requirements. Those who thus profess their faith in Christ and prove the sincerity of their profession by their actions, are to be baptized. All this is definitely taught in the case of the Samaritan sorcerer(*b*). He "believed" in profession, "and was baptized," while he had in reality "neither part nor lot" in true religion; while he was in fact "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity."† It is expressly stated that this sorcerer "was baptized." It is also definitely taught that he was not a true, but only a professed believer. In his case therefore, it is explicitly taught that a mere professed believer may be baptized. Many other publicly recognized church members who as such must have been baptized,

(*a*) See § 1. *Acts 2: 38. (*b*) See Ch. 2, § 1. †Acts 8: 12. 21.

are mentioned in the New Testament as being destitute of true faith. Several members of the churches at Pergamos, and Thiatira held to "the doctrine of Balaam" and were "fornicators." Some church members at Sardis had only a "name" to live, while they were spiritually "dead." Not a few of the Laodicians were "luke-warm" professors, while they were "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."* But these "luke-warm,"—"blind,"—"dead,"—"miserable,"—Balaamite professors, were baptized church members. Their baptism too must have been valid, or they could not have been acknowledged members of these churches. It is evident therefore that those who make a credible profession of their faith, are to be baptized. It is also evident that their baptism is valid, though they afterwards prove that they were destitute of faith; though they may afterwards become ever so immoral. By these sins, they become and remain covenant-breakers. But the demands of the covenant constantly remain in full force. By breaking God's covenant as well as his law, they become more guilty and more hardened than other sinners. A hypocrite in the church becomes, by his detestable wickedness, odious to God and man, if not to the devil. But he does not by his immoralities, render his baptism invalid.

5. *Females are proper subjects of baptism.* They were, by our Saviour, required to be baptized. The ordinance was actually administered to them by inspired men. (1.) They were commanded to be baptized. When our Saviour directs his ministering servants to "teach all nations, baptizing them;"† he commands females to be baptized, because females constitute an essential part of every nation. (2.) Females were baptized by inspired men. It is expressly stated that "women" were baptized. "Lydia" of Thyatira is even named as one female who "was baptized."‡ (3.) Families or households generally if not universally, include females. Every family therefore, the baptism of which is mentioned in the word of God, presents evidence to prove that females were baptized. Of this description are the families of the jailer, of Stephanas, of Cornelius,§ &c. Fe-

* Rev. 2: 12. 14. 15. 18. 20 and 3: 1. 14. 16. 17. †Mat. 28: 19. ‡Acts 8: 12 and 16. 14. 15. §See Acts 10: 2. 33. 44. 47. 48 and 16: 32. 33, 1 Cor. 1: 16.

males were baptized by Divine authority. They therefore may with propriety receive that holy ordinance.

In Old Testament times, females were not actually, but they were virtually, circumcised. They had this virtual circumcision in consequence of their relation to the males. That they were virtually circumcised appears from the fact that they eat the passover. No "uncircumcised person" was permitted to do this. But "the whole assembly,"—"all the congregation of Israel,"* and therefore females, were positively commanded to keep the passover. These must therefore have been virtually circumcised. But in New Testament times, females as well as males, actually receive the seal of the covenant into which God formerly entered with his visible people.

6. *Evidence to prove that adults are to be baptized, does not militate against infant baptism.* It is positively proved from the word of God, that adult persons, both male and female, are proper subjects of baptism. True believers, professed believers, the spiritually baptized, and those who repent, are to be baptized with water(*a*). But it by no means follows, that because adults may be baptized, therefore infants may not receive that ordinance. The fact that adults were to be circumcised, did not prove that infants were to be excluded from that "seal of the righteousness of—faith."† To prove that "men and women" were baptized, is to say nothing whatever against infant baptism. Such proof might favor, but cannot possibly oppose, the baptism of children. It might, with a good degree of propriety, be said, that since the child of a circumcised Israelite must be circumcised, therefore the child of a baptized christian or spiritual Israelite, must, or at least may, be baptized. But if a parent may be baptized, it does not, cannot follow as a legitimate consequence, that his child must remain unbaptized till he arrives at mature age. The fact then that adults are to be baptized, does not prove or intimate that infants may not receive the same ordinance.

It is also worthy of remark that all persons who believe in baptism with water, maintain that adults who profess their faith in Christ, may be baptized, if they have not before re-

*Ex. 12: 6. 47. 48, see also Lev. 21: 10–13, Deut. 16: 11. *(a)* See § 1–5. †See Gen. 17: 11. 24, Rom. 4: 11.

ceived that holy ordinance. When therefore immersers prove that adults are proper subjects of baptism, they merely prove what all believers in baptism with water maintain as firmly as they do. But not the least evidence is thus furnished to prove that infants are not to receive this holy ordinance.

CHAPTER IV.

INFANTS ARE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

1. *They are human beings.* A mere look at an infant will prove this position to any person of reflection. Every one can perceive at a glance that infants do not belong to the inanimate, to the brute, or to the angelic creation. No person who believes the evidence of his senses can refuse to admit that they are a part of the human race. They are therefore possessed of one thing which, in the subject, is essential to the ordinance of christian baptism(*a*).

2 *Infants are sinful creatures.* None but sinful creatures can possibly receive christian baptism(*b*). That infants are sinful is clear both from the word of God and from the experience of mankind. (1.) *The scriptures teach that infants are sinful.* It is declared that believers "were by nature the children of wrath even as others."* As God's wrath is against nothing but what is sinful; so those who are by nature children of wrath, must be by nature sinful. Believers and others are by nature children of wrath; they must therefore be sinful by nature. Infants have the same human nature which adults have; theirs must therefore be a sinful nature. The inspired Psalmist positively declares; "behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."† David "was shapen in iniquity" and "conceived in sin." This language shows that he was a sinner in some sense as soon as he was a human being. The Psalmist also affirms; "the wicked—go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies."‡ In this passage, the very first actions of men and their first articulate, and perhaps inarticulate sounds, are mentioned as sinful. Israel is "called a transgressor from the womb."§ It is also stated that

(*b*) See Ch. 1, § 3, Ch. 2, § 4. (*b*) See Ch. 2, § 4, par. 2. *Eph. 2: 3. †Ps. 51: 5. ‡Ps. 58: 3. §Isa. 48: 8.

"both Jews and Gentiles," (and there are infants among both,) "are all under sin;"—"there is none righteous, no, not one;"—"there is none that doeth good, no, not one;"—"all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."* These and similar passages of scripture prove as conclusively as language can do, that infants and all other human beings, are sinful. (2.) *The experience of mankind proves that infants are sinful.* All see that infants are liable to pain and sickness and death. They suffer all these in every stage of their existence. These are the effects of sin. It cannot, without blasphemy, be supposed for a moment that a perfectly just and Omnipotent Being, would inflict upon absolutely holy immortal creatures, all the distresses which infants often suffer. They must therefore, in the sight of God, be sinful. All who believe in a holy and just Ruler of the universe, must maintain that infants, in some sense, are sinful creatures. Those who trust to the evidence of their own senses, know that they suffer the consequences of a nature polluted with sin. All see, or may see, in them, the effects of sin. All therefore know, in their own experience, that infants are by nature sinful creatures. Human beings of every age, from their earliest infancy to the latest period of life, suffer death; and death "entered into the world" by "sin;"† every individual therefore, old or young, who is liable to death, is sinful by imputation, by nature or by practice. But as all infants are liable to death; so, in the sight of God, they must be all sinful in some sense. This all know or may know, by their own observation and experience.

3. *Infants are capable of receiving what is signified by christian baptism.* It denotes the work of the Spirit on the soul(*a*). The holy Spirit is certainly as capable of producing a new nature, a new heart, true faith, love to God, and every other essential christian principle, in an infant, as in Saul of Tarsus, while "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of" Christ.‡ By the Almighty power of God's Spirit therefore, an infant can be regenerated and have the blood of Christ applied to its soul. Moreover, infants have been truly converted or born "of the

*Rom. 3: 9. 10. 12. 23. †Rom. 5: 12. *(a)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. ‡Acts 9: 1. 4. 5 and 26: 13.

Spirit." David, after his child's death, said; "I shall go to him."* This expression intimates that the child was in a state and place of happiness; and that it had therefore been born "of the Spirit," and had thus been prepared to "enter into the kingdom of God" above.† Jeremiah was "sanctified" from his earliest infancy; and John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost" from his birth. Samuel was but a young "child" when he "ministered before the Lord." Timothy "from a child" knew "the holy scriptures."‡ These instances clearly show that infants and very young children have enjoyed the renewing grace of God's Spirit. They teach that they have experienced what is signified in christian baptism.

4. *Infants are capable of being in covenant with God.* That they can sustain this covenant relation with God, is expressly and frequently taught in the scriptures. God made "a covenant with" Noah and his "seed after" him. Abram's infant "seed," as well as himself, were required to enter into "covenant" with God. This they did according to the Divine direction. Again the Israelites positively affirm that the "Lord—made a covenant with" them "in Horeb." This "covenant" they declare was not "made with" their "fathers" but with them in person.§ The covenant which was made on a mountain which, as a whole, was called Horeb, while one part or peak of it received the name of Sinai, was entered into forty years before this language was used. When therefore this covenant was made with them, most of them must have been infants and young children.‖ That infants were received, by the special command of God, into covenant relation with himself, is a fact frequently stated in his word. But it is not necessary to mention any more instances. Those already mentioned are sufficient to convince those who believe the scriptures to be a revelation from God, that infants are capable of being in covenant with him. But if they can be a party or a portion of a party in a covenant, then they can receive its seal.

It appears therefore that infants are human beings(*a*), are sinful creatures(*b*), may be "born again"—"of the Spir-

*2 Sam. 12: 23. †John 3: 3. 5. ‡Jer. 1: 5, Luke 1: 15, 1 Sam. 1: 24 and 2: 18, 2 Tim. 3: 15. §Gen. 9: 9 and 17: 7–14, Deut. 5: 2. 3. ‖See Ex. 19: 2–20 and 20: 1–17, compared with Deut. 5: 2–22. *(a)* § 1. *(b)* § 2.

it"(*a*), and are capable of being in covenant with God. To them therefore, in common with adults, belongs whatever is essential to a subject of baptism(*b*).

It will scarcely be affirmed, even by the exclusives, that, for an unbelieving, unconverted enemy of God, like Simon the sorcerer(*c*), to profess to be a true christian, is what renders his baptism valid. For an unbeliever, while he remains such, to profess to believe in Christ, is to be guilty of a most solemn falsehood. The word of God does not teach that telling a lie, qualifies a man for baptism, or renders that ordinance valid to him, which would otherwise be invalid. The validity of Divine ordinances cannot depend on the wickedness of those who receive them.

To be interested in God's covenant and thereby entitled to its seal, personal consent in every case, is not necessary. God himself has determined this point. Into covenant with himself he received infants who, from their age, were incapable of giving or withholding their personal consent.* He made them a portion of one party in this covenant. The other was composed of adults. It is manifest therefore that, from the fact that infants have been received into covenant with God, personal consent is not in all cases necessary to enjoy an interest in that covenant into which he has entered with his visible church.

5. *Infants are guilty of nothing which can exclude them from the covenant or render their baptism invalid.* No infant is or can be guilty of any open immorality. No one of them can therefore be excluded by proper ecclesiastical discipline from the covenant. No infant can be as wicked as Simon the sorcerer was. With all the guilt of years resting on his soul, he "was baptized." He came to receive the ordinance with "a lie in his right hand;" and notwithstanding this, he, as we are positively told, "was baptized."† Simon was a practical villain, up to, and during the time of his baptism, as well as afterwards; and yet his baptism was valid. An infant free from all his open immoralities, certainly cannot be, merely on account of its infancy, a less fit subject to receive the holy ordinance of baptism than Simon was.

(*a*) § 3. (*b*) See Ch. 2, § 4. (*c*) Ch. 2, § 1, par. 1-6. *See Gen. 17: 7-14. †Acts 8: 13, Isa. 44: 20.

6. *God does not forbid the baptism of infants.* In no passage of scripture is it said that infants may not, or shall not be baptized. Nor does the word of God contain the least intimation of any such prohibition ever being given. Infants who are themselves proper subjects of baptism(*a*), are not therefore rendered unfit to receive that holy ordinance by any positive enactment. Infants then are, and will always remain, proper subjects of baptism; for God will not change their nature, nor his word in relation to them. If it had been his intention to have excluded them, in New Testament times, from the seal of the covenant, he would have expressed this his intention in some form of words. But as he has not, in any portion of the scriptures stated or even intimated in any mode of expression, that infants were to be or have been excluded from the seal of the covenant entered into with his visible people, it is certain that he did not intend to exclude them from its use. God had commanded the seal to be applied to them. To say nothing further on the subject was to leave the existing command in full force. Since therefore God has commanded the seal of the covenant to be applied to infants; and since, in New Testament times this seal is baptism; the fact that he has not forbidden them to receive baptism, the New Testament seal of the covenant, is undeniable evidence that the former command requiring them to receive this seal, remains unrepealed—is yet in full force. To secure to infants the New Testament seal of the covenant, it was not necessary to repeat the former command. To leave it unrepealed, or not to forbid them to be baptized is all that was really necessary in their case. But God has not only left the former command in full force; but he has repeated it in almost every conceivable mode of expression(*a*).

Infants are not proper communicants at the Lord's table. To them belongs every thing essential to subjects of baptism(*b*). But to them does not belong what is essential to a communicant. They are not capable of performing the external acts which are required of, and performed by, every one who partakes of the symbols of the broken body and of the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is said to all

(a) § 4, P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1, par. 13, P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1-9. *(b)* See § 1-4.

communicants, whether worthy or unworthy; "take, eat;"—"take this and divide it among yourselves;"—"drink ye all of it." These directions are given to all communicants. By them all, these external actions are all performed. Infants cannot perform these actions. They therefore cannot commune at the Lord's table. Moreover, Jesus Christ says to each communicant at his table; "this do in remembrance of me." Each communicant, whether a true believer or not, externally complies with this direction. Those who approach the Lord's table, declare externally by this action that they have examined themselves; and that they discern the Saviour's body.* Infants are, from their age, incapable of performing any one of the acts which all communicants externally perform. While therefore infants may be baptized; because, in receiving this ordinance, the subject is always passive; they are not proper communicants, because in receiving the Lord's supper, all who partake are active.

PART THIRD.

DIVINE AUTHORITY IN FAVOR OF INFANT BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

CHURCH MEMBERS ARE OR OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED.

1. *Members of the visible church in New Testament times are, or ought to be baptized.* This position is admitted by all who believe that baptism with water is an ordinance to be observed in the christian church. Each church member is in visible covenant with God. The fact that he is a church member proves this. But the person who is in covenant, or who, in other words, is a church member, has a right to the seal of the covenant. This, in New Testament times, is baptism(*a*). Every church member therefore who is not baptized, is entitled to this ordinance. Those who say that baptism is the door through which persons must pass to enter the church, must admit that all who are in it, have been baptized. Those who maintain that persons first enter into the church by being born in covenant or by entering it afterwards, must maintain that those who are in covenant ought to receive its seal, if it has not been applied to them. But

*Mat. 26: 26. 27, Mark 14: 22. 23, Luke 22: 17. 19, 1 Cor. 11: 24. 25. 28. 29. (*a*) See P. I, Ch. 3, § 6. 8.

as this seal, in New Testament times, is baptism(*a*); so therefore every member of the christian church has been or ought to be baptized.

2. *Jesus Christ teaches that infants are to be baptized.* He expressly says of certain persons; "of such is the kingdom of heaven;"—"of such is the kingdom of God."* This kingdom denotes the kingdom of God on earth or his visible church(*b*). The expression relates especially to the church in New Testament times. Certain it is that this language must in many passages of scripture, signify the christian church.† In the connection in which it is used by our Saviour, it may *in*clude, but cannot *ex*clude the church in its New Testament dispensation. Those of whom it can be properly said, "of such is the kingdom of God," must form at least a portion of the members of that kingdom. Those concerning whom this declaration is made by the blessed Jesus, are *four times* called "little children;" they are *once* called "young children," and *once* they are denominated "infants." Of these same persons who form a part, if not a principal part of his kingdom or visible church on earth, it is said; Jesus "took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them and blessed them." These "little children,"—"young children,"—"infants" whom Jesus took "up in his arms," constitute a portion of God's kingdom or visible church on earth.‡ This our Savior positively teaches. But as these infants, in New Testament times, were members of his church on earth; so they were entitled to the ordinance of christian baptism; for all such members either have been or have a right to be baptized(*c*). The language which the Holy Spirit here uses to denote "infants" is as strong and pointed as can be used on this subject. That infants form a portion of God's kingdom on earth, is therefore as certain as the language of inspiration can make the fact; and it is equally certain that as church members, they may have been, ought to have been, had been, or are to be baptized.

3. *The Spirit of God by Paul teaches expressly that infants are to be baptized.* This apostle in addressing the Galatians, calls them "brethren" and mentions those to whom

(*a*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11, See also P. i, Ch. 3, § 10, Ch. 2, § 1, par. 7. 9. 11. 13. *Mat. 19: 14, Mark 10: 14, Luke 18: 16. (*b*) See B. i, P. iii, Ch. 1, § 2. †See Mat. 3: 2 and 4: 17 and 10: 7, Mark 1: 15. ‡Mat. 19: 13. 14, Mark 10: 13-15, Luke 18: 15. 16. (*c*) See § 1.

he wrote as "churches." But some of the members of these "churches," some of these "brethren," he expressly calls "little children."* A part of these church members then were "little children." The original word (τεκνια) here translated "little children," is very pointed in its signification. It is derived from another Greek word (τεκνον) which denotes a child and sometimes one unborn.† It is a diminutive, and therefore denotes very "little children." Such language does the holy Spirit use in addressing some of the members of the "churches" in Galatia." These "little children" were singled out and specially mentioned by the Spirit of God as members of the Galatian churches. These indeed are the only class of persons thus particularly noticed in these churches. But as these "little children" were certainly members of the churches in Galatia, they were either baptized or had a right to that ordinance. To say that "little children" are members of the visible church of Christ, is to use most positive language in favor of infant baptism. Besides, these "little children" are publicly recognized as church members; they must therefore have been actually baptized; because this public recognition of church membership takes place neither before nor after, but in the very act of receiving the ordinance of baptism. Persons commune at the Lord's table, not to make them church members, but because they are such before they receive the holy supper(*a*).

4. *The Holy Spirit, by John, teaches that infants are to be baptized.* In an epistle addressed to the churches in general, "little children" are mentioned as members no less than *nine times*(*b*).‡ "Young men" and "fathers" are also specially mentioned as church members. As a body, they are collectively addressed as "beloved" and "brethren."§ In this epistle addressed to the churches in general, "little children" are much more frequently named than any other class of members. These "little children," or as the original word (τεκνια) indicates, these very "little children," are publicly recognized as members of the visible churches to whom John addressed his first general epistle. By being thus publicly recognized as church members, their baptism

*Gal. 1: 2. 11 and 3: 15 and 4: 12. 19 and 5: 11. 13. †See Gal. 4: 19 in Greek, see also Greek Lexicons. (*a*) P. i, Ch. 3, § 10. (*b*) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 8. ‡See 1 John 2: 1. 12. 13. 18. 28 and 3: 7. 18 and 4: 4 and 5: 21. §1 John 2: 13. 14 and 3: 2, 13 and 4: 1. 7. 11.

is as certainly and as definitely taught, as it could have been in any other form of words. Those "little children" whom John addresses as publicly recognized church members, he addresses as baptized persons; because all such church members, must have been baptized at the time this public recognition first took place. The holy Spirit, by John, therefore, teaches very pointedly that infants were baptized by Divine authority.

5. *Infants were baptized in the Red Sea.* This the Spirit of God very pointedly teaches. Speaking of the whole nation of Israel who came out of Egypt, God declares; they "were all baptized—in the cloud and in the sea."* The Israelites who left Egypt are called the "fathers" of the Jews who lived in the days of the apostle Paul; because they were their ancestors, not because of their age when they left the land of their captivity. When Israel left their "house of bondage," they brought with them their "young," their "sons" and "daughters," their "little ones," their "children," those who "had no knowledge between good and evil."† With these the "covenant" was made at "Horeb."‡ These "did all eat the same spiritual meat." They drank "the same spiritual drink,"—from that "spiritual Rock" which "followed them, and that Rock was Christ." Those therefore who drank from Christ, the spiritual Rock, were not the rebels that lusted "after evil things," were "idolators," were guilty of "fornication,"—"tempted" Christ and "murmured." Those then who are more particularly mentioned as the persons who left Egypt and were baptized "in the cloud and in the sea," are such as were at that time the "sons" and "daughters," the "little ones," the children who "had no knowledge between good and evil."§ Certainly these "little ones" are not excluded from among those who are said to have been baptized. It is therefore absolutely certain that these "children" who then had "no knowledge between good and evil" were baptized among the rest. The Spirit of God therefore in this account, teaches positively that infants were baptized. But as "all these things happened unto them" for "examples" to the New Testament church,‖ so now this church, by its minis-

*1 Cor. 10: 1. 2. †Ex. 10: 9. 10. 24 and 12: 37, Num. 11: 31. 33, Deut. 1: 39. ‡Deut. 5: 2. 3. §See 1 Cor. 10: 3. 4. 6–10. ‖1 Cor. 10: 6. 11.

try, in order to imitate the example here proposed for its imitation, must baptize infants.

6. *Ancient Prophets predicted that infants, in New Testament times, are to be baptized.* They clearly point out the fact that infants are to be members of the christian church. On this subject, they use such language as this; "a little child shall lead" the lion and the leopard;—"the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den;"—the Messiah "shall gather the lambs with his arm and carry them in his bosom;"—"the Gentiles—shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders;"—"a little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation;"—"my people—mine elect—are the seed of the blessed of the Lord and their offspring with them;"—"I will gather all nations—and they shall—see my glory;"—"the children of thy servants shall continue and their seed shall be established before thee;"—"their children—shall be as aforetime."* The prophets in predicting the spiritual prosperity of the church in New Testament times, use many expressions similar to those here quoted. This prophetic language clearly teaches that "little children,"—"sucking" children, "weaned" children, such "lambs" and "sons" as were to be carried in the "arms," the "offspring" of his people, their "seed," the "nations" which always and necessarily include infants, should have a standing in the christian church. But, as all church members in New Testament times have been or have a right to be baptized; so when the church membership of infants is predicted, their baptism is necessarily included. Whenever therefore infants as church members in New Testament times, are baptized; these and similar predictions are receiving their fulfillment.

7. *Every passage in the New Testament, which mentions children as living under the christian dispensation, teaches that infants are to be baptized.* These passages all inculcate infant church membership, and therefore teach infant baptism; for all church members are baptized or ought to be(*a*). Certain words are, in the New Testament, used to denote

*Isa. 11: 6. 8 and 40: 11 and 49: 22 and 60: 22 and 65: 22. 23 and 66: 18, Ps. 102: 28, Jer. 30: 20. (*a*) See § 1.

church members. To apply one of these words or more to an individual, is to call him a member of the visible church in New Testament times. The words which are descriptive of church membership, are "saints" or holy ones, "believers,"—"brethren,"—"faithful,"—"sanctified," &c. The "saints" at Rome, the "saints" at Corinth, the "saints" in Achaia, the "saints" at Ephesus, the "saints" at Philippi, the "saints" at Colosse, the "saints" at Jerusalem, &c., denote the church members in those places.* These saints are also called "believers,"—"brethren,"—"faithful,"—"sanctified," &c. As these words are used in relation to the persons to whom the New Testament epistles were written, so they must have been applicable to each of them or at least to each class of persons addressed. But all the epistles in the New Testament were addressed either to christian churches or to individual believers. When therefore "little children" or infants are addressed or mentioned as part of those to whom the epistles were written, they are addressed as church members; for what had the apostles "to do to judge" those who were "without" the pale of the church?† An inspired man would not address an epistle to a class of persons as church members when some of them were not such. When therefore an epistle addressed to a church by an apostle, mentions a particular class of persons as a part of those to whom it was written, that class must have been church members; for all to whom each of the epistles in the New Testament, was addressed, were such. When therefore children or "little children" are addressed in any one epistle or more; they are thus recognized as members of the visible church. But as members of the visible church in New Testament times, they were baptized or had a right to the ordinance of baptism(*a*). Some word which indicates church membership, is invariably used of "little children" or "infants" whenever they are mentioned as living in New Testament times. A few instances of infant church membership, may here be noticed. (1.) Church members are called saints or holy ones(*b*). Infants are called "holy," therefore infants are church members;

*See Rom. 1: 7 and 15: 25, 1 Cor. 1: 2 and 16: 1, 2 Cor. 1: 1 and 8: 4 and 9: 1, Eph. 1: 1, Phil, 1: 1, Col. 1: 2. †1 Cor. 5: 12. *(a)* See § 1. *(b)* The term saint denotes a holy one.

because the word *holy* which indicates church membership, is applied to them. It is said to parents, only one of whom is a believer; "your children—are—holy."* No true christian can ever imagine that the word "holy" in this passage of God's word, denotes "converted." This would be to give the term a very unusual signification. Besides, no person who has any experimental knowledge of the work of the spirit on his own soul, can even for a moment suppose, that because one of the parents of a child is a believer, therefore the child is born of the spirit or is truly converted. But it may with much propriety be said that the children of such parents are federally "holy," or in other words, that they are in covenant with God. The word "holy" is frequently used in the scriptures to express this covenant relation. The Jews, because they were in covenant, are called a "holy people;" professing christians, because they are in covenant, are called a "holy nation" and also "saints" or holy ones†(*a*). Whoever therefore is in visible covenant with God, is holy by profession and by covenant engagement. When infants therefore are called holy, their church membership is definitely recognized. (2.) Church members are called faithful, so also are children; therefore children are church members. Timotheus—was "faithful;" Paul "obtained mercy—to be faithful;" church members at Ephesus were "faithful."‡ These and similar declarations prove that "faithful" was a distinguishing appellation given to church members in apostolic times. But this word "faithful," which describes a church member is applied to infants. A bishop's or pastor's children must be "faithful." That these children were small, is evident from the fact that they are called children. To designate them, a word is used which in its ordinary acceptation, indicates very young persons. That they were young is manifest from the direction given to the father to have them "in subjection." This direction shows that they were so young as to be under the

*1 Cor. 7: 14. †Deut. 7: 6 and 14: 2. 21 and 26: 19, 1 Pet. 2: 9, Eph. 1: 1 in Greek. *(a)* The fancy that the word "holy" in 1 Cor. 7: 14 signifies legitimate shows too clearly the ignorance or wickedness of those who adopt it, to deserve a passing notice. It cannot deceive any one who has any knowledge of the meaning of words. It is adopted, not because it is believed; but because the force of God's truth bears very heavily on a part of their favorite system. In this way, they hope to satisfy themselves that they believe God's word, while they reject infant baptism. ‡1 Cor. 4: 17 and 7: 25, Eph. 1: 1.

special direction of the father. If they had been adults or even advanced in childhood, the direction would have been given to them. They would have been commanded to "obey" their "parents in the Lord."* But here the parochial bishop is required to have "his children in subjection." These little children must be—"faithful." They must therefore be church members; because church members and they only, are called faithful. A man is unfit to be a parochial bishop whose children are not "faithful," or are not publicly recognized as church members. (3.) Church members are said to be "sanctified;"† so are infants; therefore infants who are thus externally sanctified are visible church members. These are only a specimen of the passages which mention infants as church members in New Testament times, and which therefore prove that they were or ought to have been baptized. The evidence that infants were and are church members both in Old and New Testament times, is most pointed and conclusive(*a*); and that all church members in New Testament times are or ought to be baptized, is as certain as the language of inspiration can make any position(*b*). From the evidence here presented, it is undeniably certain therefore that infants, by Divine authority, are to be baptized.

CHAPTER II.

DEFINITE SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *The Abrahamic covenant includes infant baptism.* This covenant was made about 1900 years before the birth of Christ, and more than 400 years before the law was given to Moses on Mount Sinai.‡ A number of particulars in this covenant claim special attention. (1.) *The parties in this covenant are God and professed believers with their infant children.*§ These parties were suitable. God was one of them. The other, composed of adults and infants, was such as pleased him. (2.) *A portion of one of the parties in this covenant, was not the whole party.* One portion of one party in it was composed of adults; the other portion

*Tit. 1: 6, 1 Tim. 3: 4, Eph. 6: 1. †1 Cor. 1: 2, Jer. 1: 5 compared with Heb. 2: 11 and 10: 14. (*a*) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 8. (*b*) See § 1. ‡See Ex. 12: 40. 41 and 19: 11 and 20: 3–17, Gal. 3: 17. §See Gen. 17: 7. 12. 14.

was composed of infants. Infants alone or adults alone did not compose this party in the covenant. Both united, formed the party. If therefore Abram had excluded his infant seed from being a portion of the party in the covenant; he would have violated its provisions, as truly as if he had excluded adults. (3.) *This covenant was "everlasting."** It will therefore endure as long as either the literal or spiritual seed of Abram shall exist. (4.) *Its promise is two-fold.* It embraces spiritual blessings. This appears from the following language; "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee;"—"I will be their God." This promise includes all spiritual blessings. When God is our God; in him we possess, either actually or in reversion, every blessing.† Its spiritual blessings belong to all who enjoy the special grace of the covenant. It also embraces temporal blessings(*a*). In it God promised Abram a numerous seed, both natural and spiritual. To many of his natural seed but not to them all, God promised the actual possession of the land of Canaan on earth; and to the whole of his spiritual seed, the Canaan of rest above for an "everlasting possession."‡ The earthly Canaan was to be theirs while the earth remained; and the heavenly Canaan was to belong to the spiritual seed while heaven remains. The earthly Canaan has been conquered seventeen times(*b*). But God has never given to any people except to the descendants of Abram through Isaac, a title to that land. He made a grant of it to Abram and to this portion of his descendants. He gave it to them. All others were and are usurpers. Nor will he give the heavenly Canaan to any except to those who possess the same kind of "faith" which Abram had. (5.) *Of those in covenant, special duties are required.* God said to Abram; "walk before me and be thou perfect;"—

*Gen. 17: 7. 13. 19. Ps. 105: 10. †Gen. 17: 7. 8, Rom. 4: 16, Gal. 3: 29.

(a) Circumcision did not give to a descendant of Abram, a right to the land of Canaan. Most of the Israelites who left Egypt perished in the wilderness. These though circumcised did not enter Canaan. Those who died in Egypt from the days of Jacob till Moses was eighty years old, did not enter the promised land. The ten tribes were scattered among the nations for their sin. For the same cause, Judah and Benjamin suffered captivity for 70 years in Babylon. And the whole nation of the Jews are now and have been for more than 1700 years "aliens from" the land of Palestine. But notwithstanding all this, they have invariably practiced the rite of circumcision. If, to the mere external performance of this rite, God had annexed the promise of the land of Canaan, they would not have been expelled from it even as a punishment for their sins. ‡Gen. 17: 2. 4–6. 8, Gal. 3: 16. 29. *(b)* See Ch. Mag. vol. 8, p. 74.

"thou shalt keep my covenant,—thou and thy seed after thee." Of him who neglects to perform these duties, he says; "he hath broken my covenant."* (6.) *The seal of this covenant must be applied to adults and to infants.* The command expressly required that both should be circumcised; and in rendering obedience to this direction, both were circumcised. Abram was circumcised when he was "ninety years old and nine," Ishmael when he was "thirteen" and Isaac when he was "eight days" old. Infants were expressly required to receive this "seal of the righteousness of—faith."† This faith Abram had before he was circumcised. Isaac and Jacob after they received this "token of the covenant," and there is no evidence to prove that Ishmael whose "hand" was "against every man," or Esau the "profane"—"fornicator," ever received true faith.‡ Nor had these last or their posterity any inheritance in the land of Canaan. To this, their circumcision did not entitle them. (7.) *The seal confirms the promise made in the covenant.* To do this is the very nature of a seal. This promise is two-fold. It embraces both temporal and spiritual blessings. The seal confirms whatever is promised in this covenant. (8.) *The promise of this covenant belongs to the church in New Testament times.* The promise, being a part of the covenant, is, like that, "everlasting." It therefore extends through time into eternity. This "promise is sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham who is the father of us all." A part of what was promised in this covenant, was that Abram was to be the "father of many nations." This was to be specially fulfilled in those who, in New Testament times, were to enjoy his "faith." This promise is made to all the children of Abraham. But "they which are of faith, the same are the children of faithful Abraham;" those who are "of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham;" and "the blessing of Abraham," one principle part of which was the promise of the covenant, comes "on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." Moreover the promises were made "to Abraham and his seed—which is Christ," as the head and representative of his people. The promise of this "covenant—was confirmed

*Gen. 17: 1. 9. 14, Rom. 4: 12. 13. 18. †See Gen. 17: 10–13. 24. 25 and 21: 4, Rom. 4: 11, ‡Gen. 16: 12, Heb. 12: 16.

of God in Christ." Those who belong to Christ are "Abraham's seed according to the promise."* These and similar passages show most conclusively that the promise of the Abrahamic covenant extends to christians in New Testament times. Besides, christians are said to be "the children of promise" as Isaac was; and "Jesus Christ"—confirmed "the promises made unto the fathers."† Here then the promise of this covenant made with Abram, is, in a great variety of expressions, mentioned as belonging to New Testament christians. Abram is called the father of all believers, because he was their progenitor in this covenant. On the day of Pentecost, the promise of this covenant was urged upon the Jews as a reason why they should "repent and be baptized." To them the Spirit of God, by Peter, said; "the promise is unto you and to your children." They are also called "the children of the covenant—made with—Abraham."‡ That the promise proposed to them and to their children, was that of the Abrahamic covenant, is manifest from the fact that the language was addressed to believing parents and to their children, the very persons who were interested in the promise of that covenant. It was predicted by the prophet that, in the beginning of the New Testament dispensation of the church, persons would be empowered to work miracles, speak with tongues and prophecy. This prediction was fulfilled when the apostles were supernaturally qualified to speak sixteen or seventeen different languages or dialects, and were "filled with the Holy Ghost."§ It is not therefore to be fulfilled in every true believer. As all true believers and their children do not possess these miraculous powers, it is certain that this prophecy is not the promise which God, by his servant, proposes to them and their children. But, as all who are in Christ are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise;" so this promise must belong to them.‖ In New Testament times, therefore, the promise of the Abrahamic covenant belongs to believers and to their children. As the seal confirms the promise of the covenant, so it must belong, in some form, to all to whom the promise is made. This is made to believers and their children; the seal of

*Rom. 4: 14. 16. 18–24, Gal. 3: 7–9. 14. 16. 17. 29. †Gal. 4: 28, Rom. 15: 8. ‡Acts 2: 38. 39 and 3: 25. §See Joel 2: 28–31, Acts 2: 1. 4. 9–21. ‖Gal. 3: 29.

the covenant must therefore be applied to both these classes of persons. All who are "Christ's," whether infants or adults, are "heirs according to the promise" of the Abrahamic covenant. While therefore Christ has a people on earth, so long will this promise be theirs. (9.) *The seal of the covenant may be changed.* If it is changed, the standing of the parties in the covenant, their privileges, or its promise, cannot thereby be effected. Different materials may be used as a seal. Wax, or a wafer, or a mere mark may be employed to seal an instrument which requires to be thus confirmed. One seal may be removed and another used to supply its place. When this is done, the last as truly confirms the promise as the first. By changing the seal, the rights of the parties in the covenant, are not destroyed. By this act, their covenant privileges and obligations are neither altered nor diminished. It does not exclude either party from the covenant. Much less can this act divide one of the parties and exclude one portion of it from covenant privileges, while the other portion is retained and allowed to enjoy them all. Adults and infants together, constitute one party in this covenant. When infants are excluded, then one portion of this party is deprived of its privileges; then the covenant of God is rejected. (10.) *Circumcision is not now, and never was, since the resurrection of Christ, the seal of this covenant.* This was its seal in Old, not in New Testament times. Soon after the resurrection of Christ, "certain men—taught the brethren" that they ought to "be circumcised." But men inspired by the holy Spirit "gave no such commandment."* Those heathen converts who were baptized brethren, were not to be circumcised. To the Jews circumcision was entirely unavailing—was "nothing" in New Testament times.† Once it was a "seal of the righteousness of—faith," though after Christ's resurrection it was "nothing." From and after that time, the Jew as well as the Gentile must view circumcision as no longer the seal of the covenant which God had entered into with his professing people. (11.) *Baptism is now and always has been, since the resurrection of Christ, the seal of this covenant.* It is the only seal of membership in New Testament times. Per-

*Acts 15: 1. 24. 28. †See 1 Cor. 7: 19, Gal. 5: 6 and 6: 15.

sons partake of the holy supper because they are members of the church, not to bring them into its pale. A visible church is composed of persons who are visibly in covenant with God(*a*). Where any branch of this church exists, there are persons, by profession, in covenant with God. A covenant is a solemn agreement, the promise of which is confirmed by a seal. A church therefore supposes a covenant, and a covenant supposes a seal. In New Testament times, there is a church whose members are in visible covenant with God. This covenant must have a seal by which each person in it is publicly recognized as being by profession on the Lord's side. This seal, in some form, must be as permanent as the covenant is; because it, as a part of the agreement, confirms the promise. It has been or ought to be, applied to every person in the covenant. Baptism is that which every church member in New Testament times, has received or to which he is entitled. It is that which remains constantly with him and by which he is publicly recognized as being in fellowship with the church(*b*). When either Jews or Gentiles wished to enter the visible church in New Testament times, they were directed to be "baptized,"—or desired to be "baptized,"—or were "baptized."* It is manifest therefore that baptism is the seal of membership during the New Testament dispensation of the covenant(*c*). Besides, as circumcision is now "nothing;" baptism must now be the seal of the covenant or it has none; and if there is no seal, then there is no ratified covenant and therefore no church. But since there is a visible church, there must be a covenant whose promise is confirmed by a seal; and that, as we have no other seal of visible church membership in New Testament times, must be baptism with water. (12.) *Baptism is New Testament circumcision.* To the Collossians who were about to add the worship of angels and circumcision, to their religious service, the Spirit of God, by the apostle, says; "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism." Moreover, christians are said to be "the circumcision" who "worship God in the Spirit."†

(a) See P. i, Ch. 3. § 2. *(b)* See P. i, Ch. 3, § 10. *Acts 2: 38. 41 and 8: 12. 36. 38 and 10: 47. 48 and 16: 15. 33. *(c)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11. †Col. 2: 11. 12, see also Gen. 17: 10. 12. 14 and 21: 4, Phil. 3: 3.

Baptized christians are the circumcision in New Testament times; therefore baptism must be New Testament circumcision. Besides, the circumcision of Christ, or christian circumcision and baptism are used to denote the same spiritual blessings. But if spiritual baptism is our only spiritual circumcision, then literal baptism must be our only literal circumcision. Baptism therefore is New Testament circumcision. Moreover, all who practice baptism with water, admit by their actions that this ordinance occupies the place of circumcision. These all use baptism, not circumcision, as the ordinance by which persons are or ought to be publicly recognized as members of the visible church. They therefore all practically admit that baptism has taken the place of circumcision as the initiatory rite in the New Testament church. Moreover, it may be remarked here that Justin Martyr who was a disciple of the apostles and wrote about the year 139, less than 40 years after the death of John the Divine, states in relation to this subject; "We Gentile christians—have not received—circumcision according to the flesh, but that—which is spiritual." "Moreover we have received this circumcision in baptism"(*a*). In the year 163 he was beheaded for being a christian. Epiphanius was pastor of a church in the island of Cyprus. He was born in the year 310, and died in 403. He says; "the law had circumcision in the flesh—till the great circumcision came, that is, baptism." An apostle informs us that baptism is New Testament circumcision. Early christian writers teach the same truth. To resist or turn aside from such testimony is not a mark of spiritual wisdom. (13.) *Infants have never been excluded from the covenant; nor has the command been revoked which requires its seal to be applied to them.* God has expressly included them in this covenant as a portion of one of its parties. His positive command required its seal to be applied to them. He has not excluded them from the covenant, nor revoked this command. Adults and infants at the first, constituted one of the parties in this covenant. They constitute that party yet; for God has not excluded either infants or adults from the covenant. He has not authorized or required either to dispense with

(*a*) See Dia. with Tryphone.

the use of its seal. God requires the seal of his covenant to be applied to infants. Who then dare step forward, and, by assuming the prerogative of undoing what he has done, refuse or neglect to apply it to them? This seal in New Testament times is baptism. Adults receive it, because God has not excluded them from the covenant. Infants ought to receive it, because Divine wisdom has not excluded them. Infants and adults together constitute one party in the covenant. Whatever therefore is a proper covenant seal for adults, is a proper covenant seal for infants. No being but God has a right to exclude either from its seal. He has excluded neither; therefore neither can be excluded except by direct rebellion against God. Those who do so, not only assume the Divine prerogative of saying who shall, and who shall not, be received into covenant with God; but they reject those whom God has received and has not rejected. Since therefore God requires the seal of his covenant, which in New Testament times is baptism, to be applied to infants; those who baptize them have God's positive command for doing so. A positive command which God has given and which he has never repealed, is sufficient authority for his obedient children. (14.) *The Old and New Testament church is identically the same.* Our Saviour positively declared to the Jews that "the kingdom of God" should "be taken from" them "and given to" the Gentiles.* This "kingdom of God" or the visible church, was actually taken from them. This same "kingdom" was given to the Gentile nations. What was given to the Gentiles, was the very same which was taken from the Jews. The spirit of God by the apostle, also teaches very positively that the Old and New Testament church is identically the same. The Jewish church is called a "good olive-tree." The Gentiles are called an "olive-tree which is wild by nature." Gentile believers are represented as branches "cut out of" this wild "olive-tree." Those branches taken from the wild olive-tree, are said to be "grafted" into the "good olive-tree." Because of unbelief, some of the branches are represented as "broken" or "cut off" from the "good olive-tree," and the branches taken from the wild "olive-tree," are said to

*Mat. 21: 43.

be grafted into the "good olive-tree." Into this same "good olive-tree" the Jewish branches which were "cut off" because of unbelief, shall hereafter be grafted. It is evident from this account of the "olive-tree," that some branches were cut off and others grafted in, so that they partook "of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." But the tree was identically the same before and after the branches were broken off and others grafted in. The Jewish church, in visible covenant with God, was the "good olive-tree." Because of unbelief, its infected branches were cut off. The grafted branches were Gentile believers added to it after the resurrection of Christ. Adding Gentile believers to the Jewish church, did not, could not change its identity, any more than grafting branches into a tree can change its identity, so as to make it a different tree. Grafting branches into a tree does not tear it up by the roots. The "good olive-tree" therefore, was not destroyed, but rendered more useful, by having its unfruitful, withered and rotten branches cut off and other more valuable ones grafted into the tree in their room(*a*). To cut off from a church improper members, and receive into fellowship others who give evidence of true piety, is not disorganizing or destroying the church. It is only one way of promoting its best interests.* (15.) *The Old Testament church, though it is identically the same with the New, yet differs from it in some points.* But these points of difference do not exclude infants from the seal of the covenant. The Old Testament dispensation of the church, differs from that of the New in several points. The one extended to the Jewish nation only; the other extends to all nations. During the one, christians had only the Old Testament revelation; during the other, they have both the old and the New. The Old Testament saint looked forward to a Saviour to come; the New Testament saint looks back to a Saviour as having already come. During the Old Testament dispensation, circumcision and the passover were external ordinances; and during the New, baptism and the Lord's supper seal the covenant and confirm other blessings. While the one continued the ceremonial law must be observed; during the other, the worshipper is freed from this

(*a*) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 5. *See Rom. 11: 13–26.

yoke of bondage. But these or other differences between the two dispensations of the covenant, do not, in New Testament times, deprive the parties of their rights and privileges, nor excuse them from their covenant obligations.

This covenant then which, in the person of Abraham, God entered into with all believers and their seed, is now in full force.* Those who have a standing in it, may look to God for covenant blessings, and plead covenant promises. He has not changed this covenant. He has not excluded infants from its advantages. He has not revoked that command which requires its seal to be applied to them. The visible church, both in Old and New Testament times, is essentially one. Infants and adults composed its members at its first organization. They do so still; for God has not excluded either of these classes of persons from his church. He has, in fact, expressly recognized them both as belonging to it in New Testament times as well as during the former dispensation. If nothing had been said on this subject, except what relates to the Abrahamic covenant, no true believer in Divine revelation, could, after a careful investigation of this subject, exclude infants from its New Testament seal.

2. *Infants who are included in the new covenant, ought to be baptized.* This is the covenant of grace. It is new in opposition to the "first" covenant which is "old."† The first covenant mentioned in the scriptures is that made with Adam as the head and representative of all his natural posterity.‡ Another covenant was made with Noah and his "seed."§ Both these were made before that was entered into with Abram and his "seed." The Abrahamic covenant then was not the first or old covenant in opposition to the new. But the first to which the new covenant is opposed, must be that of works made with Adam. This is the first covenant the parts of which are mentioned in the word of God. That the new covenant is that of grace is also manifest from its promise. God says to those in this covenant; "I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people;" and they "all shall know me from the least to the greatest,—and their sins and their iniquities will

*See Gen. 17: 7 and 18: 18 compared with Gal. 3: 7. 29. †Heb. 8: 13. ‡See Gen. 2: 16. 17, Hos. 6: 7 in Heb. §Gen. 9: 9.

I remember no more." Parents and "their children after them" are expressly included in this covenant.* This promise can belong only to those who are or shall be heirs "of the righteousness which is by faith."† Believers and their children are expressly mentioned as those to whom the promise of this covenant belongs. If then infants may be and often are included in this new covenant of grace, if they may be and sometimes at least, are regenerated by the holy Spirit, if they may receive what is signified by baptism, they may, they ought to receive the sign; because none can consistently deny the ordinance of water baptism, to those who are born of the Spirit. Infants who are included in the covenant of grace, ought therefore to be baptized.

3. *Those who are prepared for heaven may be baptized.* Of the salvation of infants dying in infancy, two instances are mentioned in the word of God. Of these, one was the child of a believer, the other of an unbeliever. The first mentioned is the infant child of David. Soon after its spirit had left this world, he consoled himself by this reflection; "I shall go to him."‡ This was consolation in his affliction. But the thought of meeting his son in the world of wo, instead of being consolation, would have been the most exquisite misery. The inspired David then, the "man after" God's "own heart,"§ teaches that his departed infant son was in heaven. The other is "Abijah the son of Jeroboam." In him, though a "child" when he died, was "found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel."‖ As nothing good in the sight of God can be sent to perdition, so we have here another instance of the salvation of a young child. Moreover, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, Timothy¶ and others are mentioned as having been truly regenerated in infancy or in early childhood. If these had died in infancy, they would have been saved. Besides, if it is true, as Calvinists generally, if not universally, suppose, that all infants dying in infancy are saved through the merits of Christ and the renewing grace of the Spirit, then multitudes of infants are taken to heaven. But the fact that any are saved proves that infants may be and are fitted for heaven. If therefore infancy does not render them unfit for heaven, it cannot ren-

*Heb. 8: 10–12, Jer. 32: 39. 40. †Heb. 11: 7. ‡2 Sam. 12: 23. §Acts 13: 22. ‖1 Kings 14: 1, 3, 12, 13. ¶See Jer. 1: 5, Luke 1: 15, 2 Tim. 3: 15

der them unfit to receive the ordinance of christian baptism. And infancy appears to be the only crime alledged against these little immortals, as a reason why they should not be baptized. But if God has actually given to some and may or does give to others, the internal grace signified in baptism, it cannot be supposed that he would deny them the external sign. If he gives them "his own son" as their personal Saviour, he certainly cannot consistently with his promises, deny them water baptism. If "he freely" gives them Christ and "all things" in him, he will not withhold from them the external sign of his renewing grace.* If God, by his Spirit, prepares an infant for the society of "just men made perfect" in heaven,† it is preposterous to suppose that such an infant is not a proper person to receive baptism with water. If he gives the greater blessing, he will not in consistency withhold the less. Indeed, it is hard to imagine who may be baptized with water, if any of the truly regenerated must be excluded. It is therefore perfectly certain that those infants who are fit for heaven may and ought to be baptized.

4. *John the Baptist baptized infants.* This fact is clearly taught in the word of God. The scriptures declare that, "there went out unto" John, "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan and were baptized of him."‡ This language cannot denote less than that a considerable number of each class of persons in Jerusalem and all Judea, "were baptized of him." By the use of the indefinite word *all*, infants are as manifestly included as adults. John baptized "all Judea," or not a small portion of all classes of persons in that region of country. Infants constituted a part of the population of that country as they do of all others. As therefore, John baptized all, or some of all classes of persons in Judea and Jerusalem; so he must have baptized infants. The word *all* does not *ex*clude but *in*cludes infants as certainly as it does adults. John therefore who baptized some of all classes in or at Jordan, must have baptized infants.

5. *Christ commands his ministering servants to baptize infants.* He directs them to "teach all nations, baptizing them.§ Infants form a component part of every nation.

*See Rom. 8: 32. †Heb. 12: 23. ‡Mat. 3: 5. 6, Mark 1: 5. §Mat. 28: 19. 20.

Adult persons do so also. Christ commands his servants to baptize "all nations." This command includes all the classes of persons of which every nation is composed. He does not name adults. He does not say baptize men and women. Nor yet does he name infants. But he uses a word which necessarily includes men, women and children, or persons of every age and sex. The word "*nations*" as certainly includes infants as it does adults. It would be as impossible to find a nation without an infant, as to find one without an adult. To baptize a nation therefore is to baptize both infants and adults. A command to baptize "nations," is a command to baptize both infants and adults; because both are necessarily and certainly included in every nation. Nor has one man any more right to exclude infants from the word "nations" than another has to exclude adults from it. In the command to baptize, Christ has used the word "nations" which always and necessarily includes infants. In order to obey this positive command of Christ, infants must be baptized. Those who refuse to do so, divide, and therefore nullify the ministerial commission. To refuse obedience to a part of a command, is as truly a rejection of the authority that gives it, as to reject the whole. Those who thus nullify the ministerial commission which Christ has given to his servants, have a solemn account to settle with the King of Zion.

This commission also requires those to whom it is intrusted, to teach the nations "whatsoever" Christ has commanded. In this commission the words "teach" and "teaching" are both used. The word (μαθητευσατε) translated "teach," literally signifies *matheteuate* or disciple or receive as a learner, each person mentioned. The word (διδασκοντες) rendered "teaching," indicates the act of communicating instruction.* Christ therefore commands his ambassadors to disciple "all nations," to baptize them and instruct them in all things which he has revealed in his word. But the command does not say which is to be attended to first. If any person is so little acquainted with the scriptures as to suppose that the order of the words proves that teaching must precede baptism, because the word teach is first mentioned;

*See Mat. 28: 19. 20 in Greek.

they may be cured of that notion by attending to the fact that teaching is used after the word baptizing as well as before it. If the word "teach" preceding baptize, proves that persons must always be instructed before they are baptized; then because the word baptizing is used before teaching, persons, by that same rule, must always be baptized before they are taught. Moreover, if the preceding word always indicates that what it expresses must precede what is expressed by the subsequent word, then baptism, or being born of water, must always precede regeneration or baptism with the Spirit. Our Saviour expressly says; "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and God by the prophet says; I will "sprinkle clean water upon you," before he says, "a new heart also will I give you."* If therefore the relative positions of the words proves any thing, it proves that baptism must precede regeneration or the gift of a new heart. But the fact is, the relative position of the words does not prove any thing on this or on any other subject. The facts taught by the words, not their relative position, constitute the proof. In the command to teach and baptize, our Saviour does not declare which is to be done first, nor that one of these duties cannot be done without the other. But it is evident that a person may be taught before he is baptized. It is also equally certain that a person may be baptized before he has any proper instruction. This fact is manifest from the case of Simon the sorcerer(*a*). If, however, Christ had intended that persons must always be taught before they are baptized, he would have said so. But as he has not so taught us, we beg leave to decline implicit obedience to any additions made by man to this command of Christ. These and their other additions made to the word of God, are manifestly not intended for the promotion of his glory; but their whole object is to make the scriptures appear consistent with their own preconceived opinions. To conform to them is therefore no part of christianity.

It may be remarked, however, that infants begin to learn as soon as they are born, or very shortly after. They therefore are always, or at least often, learners, or are discipled

*John 3: 5, Ezek. 36: 25. 26. *(a)* See P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1.

before they are baptized. Before this ordinance is administered to them, they are taught. They learn by imitating the example of others if not by precept. And as to true spiritual knowledge, none of them can have less of that than Simon the sorcerer who "was baptized"(*a*). A person is discipled, becomes a learner or is taught, the moment he begins to receive instruction, as truly as he does afterwards. Children, properly speaking, are capable of being learners, and do learn from their earliest infancy. They may therefore be both taught and baptized.

It is also a fact worthy of notice, that those who have their children baptized, are always most anxious to have them taught the fundamental principles of christianity. Facts abundantly prove this position. The commission by which Christ empowered his ministering servants to baptize, requires them to baptize infants. This, their commission, cannot be divided. *His* ministers baptize those to whom their commission commands them to administer the ordinance. These are infants and adults. It does not intimate that the baptism of either class may be dispensed with or neglected.

Of the Lord Jesus Christ the prophet predicts; he shall "sprinkle many nations."* Each of these nations includes infants. Christ, by his servants, is to sprinkle them. To fulfill this prophecy, infants and adults who together compose every nation, must be baptized by sprinkling.

6. *Families were baptized by Divine authority.* This proves most conclusively that infants were baptized. The Greek word (οικος) for family, certainly includes infants. An infant constitutes a part of the family or household as truly as an adult does. Its relation, not an increase of age or stature, constitutes an infant a member of a family. House or family, and household are words often used in the scriptures. In English they frequently denote the same thing. They usually signify the children as distinct from the head of a family. When the word household is synonymous with family and the word house denotes persons, these terms in English are nearly of the same import. Two leading points here demand attention. (1.) *It is a fact that*

(*a*) See P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1. *Isa. 52: 15.

families were baptized by Divine authority. (2.) It is a fact that the Greek word (οικος) for house, denoting family, embraces infants. That these are facts will now be proved. (1.) *That families were baptized, is a fact often expressly taught in scripture.* A number of these baptized families are mentioned. (1.) Lydia and her house or "household" were "baptized." (2.) The jailer and his "house" were "baptized."* (3.) The house or "household" of Stephanus was "baptized."† (4.) Crispus and his house were baptized, for he was "baptized and believed on the Lord with all his house."‡ That this family was baptized will not be denied by those who hold that believing church members have a right to receive this ordinance, because all the house or family, as well as Crispus, "believed." (5.) Cornelius, the Roman Centurion, "with all his house," was baptized. These all "feared God,"—were "all—present before" him—heard Peter's discourse—received "the Holy Ghost,"—and were "baptized in the name of the Lord."§ (6.) The family, house or household of Onesiphorus was baptized. This is manifest from the fact that they are mentioned and saluted as members of the visible church. "The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus;"—"salute—the house of Onesiphorus."‖ (*a*). The Spirit of God does not address such language to the professed enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ. This house or family must therefore have been publicly acknowledged as members of the visible church. To be thus acknowledged, they must have been baptized. (7.) The house or "household" of Aristobulus; and (8.) That of Narcissus, were baptized. Both these are saluted as acknowledged church members, as "in the Lord" by profession, and therefore as being baptized.¶ Here are eight families which are mentioned in different forms of words as being baptized. Mereover, the inspired apostle mentions the baptism of families as a very ordinary occurrence. After stating that he had baptized one family, he says; "I know not whether I baptized any other."** If to baptize families had been very unusual, he would have known, even without inspiration, whether he had or had not

*Acts 16: 14. 15. 31–33. †1 Cor. 1: 16. ‡Acts 18: 8, 1 Cor. 1: 14. §Acts 10: 1. 2. 33–44. 47. 48. ‖2 Tim. 1: 16 and 4: 19. *(a)* See Ch. 1, § 1. ¶See Rom. 16: 10. 11. **See 1 Cor. 1: 16.

baptized more than one family among the Corinthians. Two families, that of Lydia and that of the jailer, were baptized in the little church at Philippi; more than two in the church at Corinth, that of Crispus, that of Onesiphorus, besides an unknown number of others. But if in the church at Philippi, two families were baptized, how many in proportion were baptized in the churches "at Jerusalem,"—at "Antioch,"—at "Rome,"—at "Ephesus,"—at "Thyatira,"—at "Pergamos,"—at "Smyrna,"—at "Sardis,"—at "Philadelphia,"—in "Judea,"—in "Galilee,"—in "Samaria,"—in "Galatia,"* and in all the other churches planted by the apostles? This might be a difficult question for immersers to solve. Of the christian converts mentioned in the New Testament, less than sixty are named. Of these nearly one half are mentioned after the resurrection of Christ. Though less than thirty professed believers are mentioned by name after the resurrection of Christ, their whole number must have been very great. This is undeniably certain from the language used by inspired men. "Three thousand" are mentioned,—"multitudes"—were "added to the Lord,"—"the disciples were multiplied," and "multiplied—greatly,"—"all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron—turned to the Lord,"—"many believed in the Lord,"—"a great number believed and turned unto the Lord,"—"much people was added unto the Lord,"—"a great multitude" of devout Greeks "consorted with Paul and Silas,"—"many—believed,"—"many—Corinthians—believed,"†—"many thousands" (μυριαδες) "believed."‡ This Greek word (μυριαδες) in the singular number denotes ten thousand, and in the plural, two or more times ten thousand. When the term *many* precedes this word, it must signify several times ten thousand. All these multitudes and tens of thousands, cannot signify less than thirty or forty thousand. But of all these, the names of only a very small portion are mentioned. Only about sixty in the whole New Testament are named, or one in about five hundred. About thirty of those believers who are mentioned after the resurrection, have their names recorded, or one in about a thousand. But if

*Acts 9: 13. 31 and 11: 22. 26 and 13: 1, Rom. 1: 7, 1 Cor. 16: 1, Gal. 1: 2, 1 Thess. 2: 14, Rev. 1: 11. †Acts 2: 41 and 5: 14 and 6: 1–7 and 9: 35. 42 and 11: 21. 24 and 17: 4. 12 and 18: 8 and 19: 18. 26. ‡Acts 21: 20 in Greek.

families which are named as being baptized, bear the same proportion to those which were baptized and are not named, that baptized individuals who are named bear to those who are not; then, for every family who, in the whole New Testament, are definitely named as believing and being baptized, there were at least five hundred baptized who are not named; and for every family whose baptism is definitely mentioned as taking place after the resurrection of Christ, at least a thousand were baptized who are not named. Then if only one family was named as being baptized after the resurrection of Christ, there would be, according to this proportion, at least a thousand not named; if two are named, then there would be two thousand not named; if eight families are named as being baptized after his resurrection, then, according to the proportion of baptized individuals named and not named, there must have been not less than eight thousand families who were baptized, and whose names are not on record. All the families whose baptism are definitely mentioned in the New Testament, were baptized after the resurrection of Christ. These are eight in number. Those families therefore who were baptized and are not named, must amount to at least eight thousand. Thus it appears that according to the proportion already mentioned, which a careful examination will show to be rather below than above the truth, a very large number of families were baptized by Divine authority in the apostolic age of the church. But that some families were baptized by inspired men, no believer in Divine revelation can doubt. (II.) *It is a fact that the Greek word* (οικος) *for house, certainly includes infant children.* This can be certainly ascertained. The word (οικος) for house, signifying a family, is frequently used in the scriptures. Its signification, from the connection in which it is found, is generally manifest. Its true import ought to be carefully sought, lest man's assertion should be mistaken for God's word. This may be noticed in a number of particulars. (1.) *It primarily signifies children, little children, infants.* In the Septuagint(*a*) the Greek word (οικος) for house often denotes infants and them only. It is said to David; "the Lord—will make thee a" (οικος) "house,"—he "will build

(*a*) The Old Testament in Greek.

thee a" (οικος) "house." David prayed saying; "bless the" (οικος) "house of thy servant,"—"let the" (οικος) "house of thy servant be blessed forever;"—and God says to him, "thy" (οικος) "house—shall be established."* David in prayer, says, "let the" (οικος) "house of David—be established,"—"thou, O—God, wilt build" thy servant a (οικος) "house,"—"bless the" (οικος) "house of thy servant."† God said to Jeroboam, "I—will—build thee a sure" (οικον) "house."‡ In these passages God is represented, as making, building, establishing and blessing the (οικος) house. Nothing is more evident than that the house mentioned in these portions of the word of God, denotes the family, not the place of its abode. A family can be built up or increased in one way and in no other. Infants must be born as members. When God built up David's family or house, infant children were added to it. Each one of his descendants must have been an infant the very moment it became a part of his house or family which God was thus building up. Each member of which a house or family is built, must begin its relation in infancy. By adding infants to David's family, his house was made or built up. By them only can a family be established so as to be, by actual members, perpetuated for ages to come. When therefore God establishes a house or family for generations to come, he always invariably does so by the addition of infants to it. To do this children must be born to the parents. Therefore, whenever God speaks of a house which he builds, makes, establishes or blesses; infant children are invariably and necessarily intended by the word house. Moreover, it is said of him who refused to marry his brother's wife, he "will not build up his brother's" (οικον) "house."§ Unborn infants are the house here mentioned. Infants only could build up the house or family of him who had died childless. Infants yet unborn at the time, are the only persons that could possibly build up the deceased brother's house or family. Here therefore the word house evidently signifies infant children; for a house can be built up of no others. These only can make up the family where no children are yet born. Of Rachael and Leah, it is said; they "two did build the" (οικον) "house of Israel."‖ They did this by be-

*2 Sam. (called in Gr. 2 Kings) 7: 11. 16. 27. 29 in Gr. †1 Chron. 17: 24. 25. 27 in Gr. ‡1 Kings (called in Gr. 3 Kings) 11: 38. §Deut. 25: 9. ‖Ruth 4: 11. 12 in Greek

ing the mothers of children and in no other way. To Boaz before his marriage, it was said; "let thy" (οικος) "house be like the" (οικος) "house of Pharez—of the seed which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman."* That which was to build up the house or family of Boaz, was certainly infants not born when this language was used. In the New Testament the word (οικος) house denotes infant children. The inspired apostle says; "I will—that the younger women marry, bear children" and "guide the house."† In this passage the "younger women" are directed to "guide" or rule "the house." They are to be (οικοδεσποτειν) house-rulers. It is a fact, well known, that infants, in the early part of their lives, can be guided or ruled only by the mother. The word (οικος) house, must therefore be used in this connection to denote infants or very small children. When they become somewhat advanced in childhood, the father or others may assist in guiding them. But as the mother only is here directed to "guide the house;" so therefore the word house must signify infants or very small children and no other persons. (2.) *The word house denoting a family, is frequently used where infants are certainly included.* Jacob desired to "provide for" his "own" (οικον) "house."‡ This was before he began to serve Laban for his cattle. He had served him fourteen years for his two daughters. Seven years of this time had passed before he married Leah and Rachael. He had therefore been married to his wives only seven years when he desired to "provide for" his "own" (οικον) "house." At this time, by his four wives, he had eleven sons and one daughter.§ The "house" then for which he wished to "provide" included twelve children all less than seven years of age. It is perfectly certain therefore that the word house, in this connection, includes infants or very small children. Of the "children of Israel" who "came into Egypt," it is said; "every man and his" (πανοικι) "household," literally his whole house, "came with Jacob."‖ The (οικος) "house of Jacob which came into Egypt," was composed in part of "little ones" or infants. This is expressly stated in the account given of their depar-

*Ruth 4: 11. 12 in Gr. †1 Tim. 5: 14 in Greek. ‡Gen. 30: 30 in Gr. § See Gen. 29: 20. 21. 27. 28. 30–35 and 30: 4–13. 17. 21. 23. 28–34 and 31: 41 all in Greek. ‖Ex. 1: 1 in Greek.

ture into that land of cruel oppression.* Of the nation of Israel, "great, mighty and populous," which, like all nations, must have included infants, it is said; God made Ezekiel "a watchman unto the" (οικω) "house of Israel."† In this passage, the word house is synonymous with nation. It therefore must include infants and young children; because no nation can exist without these. The expressions, "the" (οικος) "house of Israel,"—"the" (οικος) "house of Jacob,"—"the house of Judah,"—"the house of David,"—"the house of Jeroboam,"—"the house of Ahab,"‡ &c., must necessarily include infants. Each of these expressions denotes all the descendants of the person mentioned in it. Among these, infants must therefore be included. Indeed, each one of their descendants, must have been an infant the moment it began to compose a part of the house or family. That infants are included in the word (οικος) for house is therefore certain. In the (οικος) house of the bishop or pastor and in that of the deacon, mentioned by the apostle Paul, infants must have been included; because each is commanded to rule his house well.§ In these and in many other passages of scripture, the word (οικοσ) for house is so used as necessarily to include infants or very young children. (3.) *The Greek word for house is used to denote children as distinct from their parents.* The Lord said unto Noah, "come thou and all thy" (οικοσ) "house into the ark;"—Jacob in fear of the Canaanites, says, "I shall be destroyed, I and my" (οικοσ) "house;" of those who went down into Egypt, it is said, "every man and his" (πανοικι) whole house or "household came with Jacob;"—to Israel God gave the command, "ye shall rejoice,—ye and your" (οικοι) "households" or houses;—to each one of them he said, "thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy" (οικοσ) "household," or house, and again, "thou shalt eat" the firstling,—"thou and thy" (οικοσ) "household" or house;—of the heave-offering, he directed them and their (οικοι) "households" to eat;—God said to David, "behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own" (οικου) "house," or from among thy children;—the (οικου) house which the bishop and the (οικων) houses which

*See Gen. 43: 8 and 45: 19 and 46: 5, 27. 31 in Gr. †Deut. 26: 5. Ezek. 3: 17 in Gr. ‡See 1 Kings (called in Gr. 3 Kings) 12: 19-21. 26 and 15: 29 and 16: 3 and 21: (in Gr. 20:) 22, Isa. 58: 1, Ezek. 11: 15 and 18: 15, Zech. 12: 7. 8. 10. 12. 13, Luke 1: 27 and 2. 4, Heb. 8: 8. 10 in Gr. §See 1 Tim. 3: 4. 5. 12 in Greek.

the deacons were to rule could not include the rulers.* From each of them their family or house must have been distinct. In each of these passages, it is perfectly manifest to any one, even to the most superficial and prejudiced, that the word (οικοσ) house signifies children as distinct from their parents. (4.) *The Greek word for house, when it is used for persons, always denotes relations, and almost always descendants.* It signifies connections by affinity or marriage as well as by consanguinity or by blood. But when it signifies a family, it in no instance includes servants or strangers. It often denotes descendants for a number of generations. All this is manifest from the passages already quoted; especially those which mention the house of Noah, of Israel, of Jacob, of David, &c. It is therefore evident from what has been said in this section that when the word (οικοσ) for house is used in the scriptures to denote persons; it primarily and principally signifies infants, and only in a secondary sense and very seldom does it denote or even include adults. This word (οικοσ) is once used by the Holy Spirit to denote a mother and a grand-mother or aunt. It is not certain which is included, as the original word (εκγονα) may signify either grand-children or nephews. The language is this "if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to show piety (ιδιονοικον) "at home," literally to their own house, or in other words, to their mothers and aunts or grand-mothers.† Moreover, it ought to be observed that the word (οικοσ) for house, is not, in the New Testament and very seldom if at all in the Septuagint, used to denote married persons without children.

Uninspired writers frequently use the Greek word (οικος) for house in the scriptural sense here mentioned. In the Apocrypha, it is said; "the blessing of the father establisheth the" (οικους) "houses of children."‡ In this quotation *houses* must denote children. They are said to be established by the blessing of the father. He whose blessing is mentioned is represented as the father of the children whose houses are blessed. The term houses therefore here signifies the children of children or grand-children. A grand-

*Gen. 7: 1 and 34: 30, Ex. 1: 1, Deut. 12: 7 and 14: 26 and 15: 20, Num. 18: 31, 2 Sam. (Gr. 2 Kings) 12: 11. 1 Tim. 3: 4. 5. 12 and in Greek and English. †1 Tim. 5: 4, in Gr. ‡Eeclus. (called in Greek, the wisdom of Sirach) 3: 9.

father by his blessing or approbation can do much to establish his grand-children in ways of wisdom and virtue. Through this instrumentality a family may be so established as to continue from generation to generation. A "house" (οἶκον) is said to be "a thrice Olympic victor"(*a*); when a person(*b*), his father(*c*) and his grand-father(*d*) were each victorious in the Olympic games. A noted Greek writer who was born and educated in Greece, defines the word (οἶκος) for house. He says it signifies, "a society long connected together according to the course of nature"(*e*). Such a society is composed of "those who eat at the same board"(*f*),—or of "those who sit around the same fire-side"(*g*),—or of "those who sit around the same table"(*h*),—or of "those who are free by birth"(*i*). Such a society is what Aristotle calls (οἶκος) a house, when that word denotes persons. It must therefore primarily and necessarily denote or include infant children. These are always and incontrovertibly connected to their parents and to each other according to the course of nature. It cannot include servants; for these are not supposed to be so connected; nor are they born free.

The Arabs use their word for house, or they say those at home, when they speak of their wives and daughters(*j*). The Latin word (*domus*) for house is frequently used to signify a family including infants. The modern Italian word (*casa*) for house is often used in the same sense. The English word *house* is sometimes in the present day, but was much more frequently in former periods, used to express a family including all the children of every age. No term can be used which will more certainly denote or include infants than the word (οἶκος) house or family. It is in fact used, by different Greek writers, more than three hundred times, in such connection as to express or include infant children.

When this word (οἶκος) house denotes persons, it is used metaphorically. All proper metaphors have a special reference to language in its literal import. Metaphorical language is not therefore the fancy of a disordered mind. To use it, is a proper, though not a literal, mode of speaking.

(a) See Pind. Ode. 13. *(b)* Xenophon. *(c)* Thessalus. *(d)* Pteodorus. *(e)* See Aristotle's Polity, B. i, Ch. 2. *(f)* Charondas. *(g)* Epimenides the Cretan. *(h)* Du Val, the editor of Aristotle's works. *(i)* Aris. Pol. B. i, Ch. 3. *(j)* See Man. Arabs by D'Arieux.

A literal house among the Hebrews was a permanent habitation. It was usually built of stone or of some similar materials. It was essentially different from the tent. This last was moveable and constructed of perishable materials. When a house was to be built literally, the walls were raised by adding stones or other suitable materials to the building which persons were erecting. A metaphorical house or family is therefore built up by adding to it living metaphorical materials. If it be asked, what is to be added to a house or family to build it up? the only proper answer that can be given to the question is this; infants must be born to increase the family or house. Whenever therefore God speaks of building a house or family, he speaks of infants being born to compose or increase it. No other materials can build a metaphorical house. These then must form it whenever it is built up.

If servants or property were to be included in a word, another was used by the Greeks. They then employed a word (οικια) for which it is difficult to find an exact substitute in the English language. Household, denoting the family or house and what holds to it, expresses more of its meaning than any other single English word. But the term (οικια) itself includes or may include the family, the dwelling, the out-houses, the servants and the property in and near the buildings. This compound idea is frequently at least, embraced in this one Greek word. To perceive that the meaning of (οικος) the word for house or family is included in (οικια) the one which includes all this compound idea, we have only to examine the meaning of these two words (οικος and οικια) as indicated by the connection in which they are found. The signification of each can be definitely ascertained. The meaning of one of them (οικος) has already been noticed. That of the other (οικια) will now be briefly examined. This word (οικια) says a noted uninspired Greek writer(*a*), is used to denote both "bond and free." But let us find its meaning in God's book. A few paragraphs from the inspired word, will show its meaning as taught by perfect wisdom. *It includes servants.* This is taught in the salutation "of Cæsar's" (οικιας) "household."* About the year 64, when this was written, not one of Cæsar's relations had

(*a*) Aristotle. *Phil. 4: 22 in Greek.

been converted to christianity; but at that time a number of his servants had embraced the christian faith. The word (οικια) therefore which includes servants is used, not that (οικος) which denotes kindred or relations. Our Saviour declares "the servant abideth not in the" (οικια) "house forever."* Here the word (οικια) signifies or certainly includes the apartments appropriated to the servants for their special accommodation. *It denotes out-houses.* It is said of Christ and his mother; "there was no room for them in the inn;" yet the wise men, "when they were come into the" (οικιαν) "house—saw the young child with Mary his Mother." The word here certainly denotes a stable or an out-house; for Jesus after his birth was laid "in a manger."† *This word* (οικια) *includes the property belonging to the family.* This truth is taught in the charge brought by our Saviour against the Pharisees. He says to them; "ye devour widows" (οικιας) "houses."‡ *These words* (οικος and οικια) *are not synonymous; nor are they so nearly so, that the one may be substituted for the other.* The account which God, by his inspired servant, gives of the conversion of Cornelius the Roman Centurion, proves this position. His dwelling including his family, is five times expressed by (οικος) one of these words. He "feared God with all his" (οικω) "house;"—an angel directed him to send for Peter "into his" (οικον) "house;"—Peter and "six brethren—entered into the man's" (οικον) "house;"—"he had seen an angel in his" (οικω) "house;" —"thou and all thy" (οικος) "house shall be saved."§ The dwelling, out-houses, servants and family of Simon the tanner or his whole establishment is four times expressed by (οικια) the other word. The tanner's (οικια) "house is by the sea-side;"—the men enquired "for Simon's" (οικιαν) "house;"—Peter "is lodged in the" (οικια) "house of one Simon a tanner;"—"three men" came "unto the" (οικιαν) "house where" Peter "was."‖ In this account, the angel, the inspired writer of the Acts, Cornelius, his servants and Peter, all use these words. But in no instance is the one substituted for the other. The Spirit of God does not therefore use them as if they were synonymous. Moreover, the one (οικος) expresses only a part of what the other (οικια) sig-

*John 8: 35 in Greek. †See Mat. 2: 11, Luke 2: 7. 12. 16 in Greek. ‡Mat. 23: 14 in Greek. §Acts 10: 2. 22 and 11: 12–14 in Greek. ‖Acts 10: 6. 17. 32 and 11: 11 in Greek.

nifies. The word which denotes only a part of any thing cannot be synonymous with that which expresses the whole. Besides, the one (οικος) is masculine and the other (οικια) is feminine. This their difference of gender, as well as their difference of signification, shows that they cannot be interchanged. It appears therefore that the meaning of the word (οικος) for house denoting a family, is definitely fixed in the Greek language; that it primarily and principally signifies infants; and that it is very seldom if at all used where infants are not included. It is also manifest that where servants and others compose the whole or a part of the society mentioned, another word (οικια) is used.

If then this word (οικος) for house is employed when families are said to be baptized; no language can more definitely express infants. When children and little children are mentioned as baptized church members as they frequently are, the unsupported assertion is often made; these are metaphorical children or infants. This declaration is made without any authority from God's word for doing so. It is intended merely to ward off the arrow of conviction from the heart and conscience of those who make the assertion. But when the word (οικος) for house or family is used almost invariably to signify or include infants; there is no way, when this is used for those who were baptized, to escape from the force of truth, but by denying such an array of facts as infidelity itself would hesitate to encounter.

The Spirit of God by inspired writers used such language as would convey ideas to the mind of the careful reader of the word. The scriptures were written to be searched and understood. The words used by the writers of them, were those usually employed by others on similar subjects. The Spirit suggested to their minds suitable words to express the exact will of God in every part of their writings.* If any one in the days of the apostles had said to a Jew, whether learned or unlearned, a (οικος) house was baptized; the idea of infant baptism would have been instantly presented to his mind. He would know that the word (οικος) denoting persons signified infants and certainly included them as distinct from their parents. He would at once perceive that the

*See 1 Cor. 2: 13.

word expressed descendants however young they might be. Every Jew was too much accustomed to such expressions as "the" (οικοσ) "house of Israel,"—"the house of Jacob,"—"the house of Judah,"—"the house of David," &c., to doubt for a moment that this word (οικοσ) primarily signified or necessarily included infants. If to a Grecian, learned or unlearned, it was said; a man's (οικοσ) house was baptized, the word (οικοσ) would immediately convey to his mind the idea of a "society connected together according to the course of nature,"—"descendants,"—or the "free-born" children residing under the same roof. The expression would teach him that infants were certainly baptized; for this word (οικοσ) for house denoting persons, almost always in Greek signifies or includes them.

If to a person acquainted with the Greek language, it had been said; Lydia "was baptized" and her (οικος) house or "household," he would from the force of the words, be informed that little children or infants were baptized. This he would easily perceive was taught or certainly included in the word (οικος) house or "household" here used. He would know from the use of this word that her servants, if she had any, were not included. If the Spirit of God had intended to teach the world that servants were embraced among those who are here mentioned, another word (οικια) would have been employed. But besides the use of a word (οικος) which denotes or certainly includes children however young, all the circumstances of the case prove that Lydia's family were infants or very young children. (1.) It is not said that they went to the place for prayer by the "river-side,"—or that they "heard" the preaching,—or that "the Lord opened" their hearts,—or that they "worshipped God,"—or that they were "faithful to the Lord,"—or that they attended to the business of selling "purple,"—or that they invited or "constrained" the apostles to abide with them,—or that these "entered into" their "house" after they left the prison.* These eight circumstances are all mentioned of Lydia, not one of them of her household or family that were baptized. If any one of her family had been an adult, that one would certainly have been included with the mother in some of these statements. (2.) Lydia,

*Acts 16: 14. 15. 40.

in addressing the apostles, speaks as if she had her whole family and possessions under her own special control. She says, "my house;" not our house. This shows that her children must have been quite young. (3.) The sacred writer speaks of her as having entire control over each individual in her house or family. He says, she was "a seller of purple,"—"she besought us,"—"she constrained us,"—Paul and Silas "entered into the house of Lydia," &c. These expressions show that she and no other person, had a right to invite guests to her house; and that therefore her children must have been very young. If they or any of them had been adults, they would have enjoyed this right in common with the mother, if she gave no order to the contrary. That she did not forbid her children to invite the apostles to her house, is manifest from two facts. These facts are; the Lord had opened her heart; and she herself invited them. She being now a christian, would not forbid her children to invite the Lord's servants to her house; nor would she forbid them to do what she herself did. (4.) The family of Lydia in not mentioned except in connection with her baptism. If she is baptized then her (οικος) family is mentioned; if she is not baptized, then her household is not so much as named. That not one of Lydia's house, household or family, is mentioned except at their baptism, will be manifest to any one who will read the whole account with care. It is said that "they," Paul, Silas and Timothy, "went through the cities" in Asia Minor;—"we," Paul, Silas, Timothy and the writer(*a*) of the Acts, (for the term *we* includes the speaker or writer,) "endeavored to go into Macedonia;"—"we," the same persons, "were in that city—certain days;"—"we went out of the city by a river side—and sat down;"—Lydia "constrained us." This word *us* expresses the same persons. When these servants of God had cast a "spirit of divination" (*b*) out of a damsel, her masters caught Paul and Silas, and the magistrates cast them into prison. The other two must have escaped, for it is not said or intimated that they were caught or imprisoned. These two found a place of concealment in Lydia's house. This we learn from the fact that after Paul and Silas were re-

(*a*) This was Luke the Evangelist. (*b*) A Pythonic spirit or a spirit of Python (Greek.)

leased from confinement, they "entered" her "house," saw "the brethren,"—"comforted them and departed—to Thessalonica." Timothy joined Paul and Silas again at Berea. Luke the writer of the Acts, the other brother left at Philippi, did not join them again till they came "to Troas." He says, they "tarried for us at Troas, and we sailed—from Philippi—and came unto them to Troas."* The brethren whom Paul and Silas saw at the house of Lydia, are not called her children, her servants, or her (οικοσ) house or family. The word (αδελφουσ) "brethren," does not intimate that they were her descendants, but rather the contrary. Every circumstance of the case therefore, as well as the positive language used, shows that Lydia's family or household was composed of little children. In the Syriac translation of the New Testament(*a*), this passage is thus rendered; Lydia "was baptized and the children of her household." If the word *little* had preceded children in this translation, the exact meaning of the inspired word (οικοσ) used for Lydia's family would have been given.

If it was said *to* a native Greek, as the Philippian jailer probably was; "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy (οικοσ) "house;" and if it was said *of* him as it was of the jailer; "he—was baptized—and all his straightway;" he would from the use of the word (οικοσ) house, expressed, and from the use of the same word implied, at once conclude that infants were baptized. The jailer and his (οικοσ) house, were baptized. If it is asked, who besides the jailer was baptized on that occasion? the answer must, from the connection, be his (οικοσ) house, or family. This word, as has been shown, signifies *primarily* little children or infants. When it is said, Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house, another word (οικια not οικοσ) is used for house or household. The gospel was preached to him and to all that were (εν τη οικια) on the premises, or to him, to the prisoners and to his servants. All these may be included in this Greek word (οικια). But when his baptism is mentioned, then he is "baptized" and all his (οικοσ) house or family. After he was baptized; he "brought" Paul and Silas "into his" (οικον) "house"

*Acts 15: 40 and 16: 1. 4. 10. 12. 13. 15-19. 23. 40 and 17: 1. 4. 10. 13. 14 and 20: 5. 6.

(*a*) This translation was made in the year 133 or before.

or family apartment, and "rejoiced—with" (πανοικι) "all his house."* Here the very same word (πανοικι) which is used in the Septuagint to include the "little ones" of Jacob's family which came down into Egypt, is employed to express the jailer's family. When used of Jacob's descendants, it certainly includes infants. When God uses it of the jailer's house, no one ought to venture to say, it *ex*cludes them. But as it certainly includes infants in the one connection; it does so also in the other, unless they are *ex*cluded by some form of expression. From the language used in relation to the baptism of the jailer and his (οικος) house, it is certain that his family or little ones were baptized; for the word (οικος) house, when it signifies persons, primarily denotes infants or small children. That the jailer's family was composed of or at least included little children, is farther manifest from the circumstances incidentally mentioned in the account. (1.) It is not stated that one of his children was advanced to adult age. God uses a word (οικος) to express his family, which primarily denotes infants. He does not say that one of them was grown up, or even advanced in childhood. To believe therefore that they were adults, is to believe without evidence; it is to believe against the most pointed proof. Those who give their assent to that and to that only which is proved, will not believe that any member of the family either of the jailer or of Lydia, was an adult; because there is not the least intimation given by inspiration or in any other way, to show that any member of either family was grown up. (2.) The jailer had not passed the prime of life. This appears from three considerations. *He was a jailer;* this office required, for the proper discharge of its duties, all the vigor of manhood. *He was rash;* he drew out his sword and would have killed himself. This action savors rather of youth than of the cool deliberation of age and experience. *He was active;* "he sprang" into the inner prison where Paul and Silas were made fast in the stocks. This action indicates vigorous activity. These three circumstances incidentally mentioned, show clearly that the jailer had not passed the meridian of life. He was therefore comparatively a young man. But if he was young; it is

*See Acts 16: 23. 27. 29. 31–34, Ex. 1: 1 in Greek.

rather worse than fancy to suppose that all his children were adults. It is therefore manifest from the use of a word (οικος) which primarily denotes infants, and from the incidental facts mentioned by inspiration in the account of his baptism and that of his family, that it was composed of or certainly included infants.

Remarks similar to these might be made in relation to each family whose baptism is definitely mentioned in God's word. In speaking of the baptism of each of these, the word (οικος) for house is used. This primarily signifies infants. It always, or at least, almost always, when it does not distinctly signify, certainly does include them. No word can more definitely express infants than this does. When the (οικος) house denoting persons is said to be baptized, no language can more pointedly teach the doctrine of infant baptism. In the Old Testament in Greek, this word (οικος) is frequently used. It often denotes infants and no other persons. When, at any time, its signification is more general ; it, in almost every instance includes them. Greek writers define this word so as certainly to *in*clude infants. Did the Spirit of God by using the same word (οικος) *ex*clude them ? Infant children are primarily intended when this word (οικος) is used to denote persons. When God's inspired servants are said to baptize the (οικος) house or family, infant children are intended by the language used. If men assert that these are excluded, some evidence to prove their position, becomes indispensable. Sensible men who believe what is proved, cannot admit that a word (οικος) which primarily denotes infants, *ex*cludes them or means adults only, without some shadow of evidence. When God, speaking of the baptism of a family, uses a word (οικος) which denotes or necessarily includes infants ; those who affirm that all the persons composing those families whose baptism is mentioned in the word of God, were adults, ought to prove their position. God, when he says that the (οικος) house or family were baptized, declares, by the word used, in favor of infant baptism. Let him therefore who rejects the baptism of infants, stand forth and prove, not by assertions and questions, but by evidence, that every individual in the families of Lydia, of the jailer, of Cornelius, of Stepha-

nas, &c., was an adult. Let him show which of the sacred writers declares this. Let him name the book, chapter and verse in the scriptures, in which we are informed that these families were all adults. Let him show that inspired men were mistaken when they used a word (οικος) for house or family which primarily denotes or necessarily includes infants. Let him prove that the "house" or family which the younger women were to "guide," was composed entirely of adults. Let him point to the passage of scripture in which this is taught. To show that the word (οικος) house denoting persons, signifies infants or necessarily includes them, thirty or forty instances have been cited; and if these are not sufficient to convince the most sceptical, hundreds more can be produced to prove the same fact. But not the least scriptural evidence can be produced to prove that, in any one or more of the families whose baptism is mentioned in the word of God, a single adult was included among the children. The word (οικος) house has a number of other significations in scripture, such as dwelling, heaven, &c. But as these have no particular reference to the subject of baptism, they are not noticed here.

7. *The whole force of the Greek language is used by the Holy Spirit in favor of infant baptism.* Six words (βρεφος, βρεφυλλιον, παις, παιδιον, τεκνον, and τεκνιον) in Greek are used to denote infants or little children. Of these (βρεφος) the one denoting a new born child and (παις) that denoting a small child, are roots. The word (τεκνιον) for a little child, is derived from (τεκνον) that which signifies a child. This last is derived from (τεκνοω) one which means to procreate. These four words (βρεφος, παις, τεκνον and τεκνιον) are used in the Greek New Testament for infants that were to be or had been baptized. Of the "infants" concerning whom our Saviour says; "of such is the kingdom of God," the word (βρεφος) for young infant, and (παιδιον) that for young child, are employed.* Of some of the baptized Galatians, the word (τεκνιον) for little child is used.† To express some of the baptized church members addressed by John in his epistles, the words (τεκνιον, παιδιον and τεκνον) denoting little child, infant and child, are used.‡ Moreover, the inspired

*See Luke 18: 15. 16 in Greek. †See Gal. 4: 19 in Greek. ‡See 1 John 2: 1. 12. 13. 18. 28 and 3: 7. 10. 18 and 4: 4 and 5: 2. 21 in Greek, 2 John 1: 13 in Gr.; 3 John: 4 in Gr.

Peter calls some of the church members to whom he wrote (τεκνα) "children."* Thus all the words in the Greek language, which signify infants or little children, except two derivatives, are used by inspired men to express those who were baptized or had a right to the ordinance of baptism(*a*). These two derivatives do not express infant children any more definitely than their primitives. The force of these is therefore expressed by their roots. Thus the whole force of the Greek language is brought by Divine wisdom to sustain the doctrine of infant baptism Every word in that elegant and copious language, which can express infants however young, is used by inspired men to designate those who, as publicly recognized church members, must have been baptized.

A few of the leading evidences in favor of infant baptism, may here be summed up. (1.) Jesus Christ commands his ministers to baptize nations.† Nations certainly include infants; therefore he certainly commands his ministers to baptize infants. (2.) The Jewish nation certainly included infants. The whole Jewish nation were "baptized in the cloud and in the sea"‡(*b*); therefore infants were certainly baptized. (3.) Jerusalem and all Judea in the days of John the Baptist, certainly included infants.§ John baptized "all" these; he therefore certainly baptized infants. (4.) All publicly recognized church members have certainly been baptized(*c*). "Infants" or "little children" are, by inspired men, often mentioned as publicly recognized church members; therefore they certainly recognize infants as having been baptized. (5.) The word (οικος) for house or family certainly includes infants. When the baptism of families by inspired men, is mentioned; this word (οικος) is used to designate those who received the ordinance of baptism;‖ therefore they certainly baptized infants. (6.) The Greek language can teach the doctrine of infant baptism. The whole force of that language is employed by Divine wisdom to teach infant baptism; therefore the doctrine of infant baptism is taught by its varied and pointed expressions on this subject. Those who can resist such evidence, would not be

*1 Pet. 1: 14 in Greek. (*a*) See Ch. 1, § 1-4. †See Mat. 28: 19. ‡See 1 Cor. 10: 2. (*b*) B. iii, P. i, Ch. 2, § 5. §See Mat. 3: 5. (*c*) Ch. 1, § 1-4. ‖See Acts 16: 15. 31-34 in Greek.

convinced though one "rose from the dead" to bear testimony in favor of this important truth.

8. *God intimates that infants are to be baptized.* Addressing church members, God says to them; "ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints."* The parents are "fellow-citizens with the saints," by external profession. Externally they are on the Lord's side. They professedly belong to his kingdom. But it is a settled principle that infant children are citizens of the same government with the parents. If this be a correct principle, and no defect is perceived in it, then the infant children of God's professed people must be externally on his side. When the parent is a citizen in human governments, so are his infant children. When the parent is externally a fellow-citizen "with the saints," so must his infant children be; for God has not excluded them. Infants, in all well-regulated human governments, enjoy certain privileges which they are capable of receiving. If God's kingdom is not less favorable to parents and to their infant offspring, than human governments are; then in his visible kingdom, infants may receive those privileges which they, in common with all its other members, are capable of receiving. But infants are capable of receiving baptism(*a*); they may therefore on this principle, receive that ordinance. What government, even among men, would refuse to all infants born of its citizens, the protection and rights due to them? It is a blessing to know that God has received them into his visible kingdom, and has never excluded them from it or from the seal of visible church membership. Indeed, he has expressly recognized them as belonging to and constituting a part of his kingdom.† In this way, God manifestly intimates that infants are to be baptized and thus publicly recognized as members of his visible kingdom.

9. *God, by implanting parental affection in the human breast, indicates that infants ought to be baptized.* The parent who really desires to be in covenant with God, will desire to have his children sustain the same relation. The cords of affection bind the parent's heart to the child. God has implanted this affection in the parental bosom. It leads

*Eph. 2: 19. *(a)* See P. ii, Ch. 4, § 1–4. †See Gen. 17: 1–14. 23. 25–27 and 21: 4, Luke 18: 16, 1 John 2: 1, 12, 13.

the parent to desire for his child, the same blessings which he desires for himself. The parent therefore who sincerely desires to be himself in covenant with God, and really values that relation, will desire to bring his children with him into this covenant relation. God therefore directed Abram to bring his seed into the same covenant into which he himself was permitted and required to enter. Nor has he ever yet excluded either believing parents or their infant children from an interest in that covenant. When an adult receives the seal of the covenant, God does not then break the cords of affection which bind him to his child. He permits, he requires the child, as well as the parent, to be dedicated to the Triune God in baptism. Thus another cord, and that a sanctified one, binds the parent's soul to that of his infant child. The voice of God therefore speaking through the parent's heart, directs him to dedicate in baptism, his infant seed to the Triune Jehovah.

Infants are human beings. They are not animals or inanimate matter. What perfect heartlessness must that man possess who can speak of infants destined to an undying existence, as if they were mere animals!! To such we would merely say; the infant's God hears your inhumanly vulgar language. It is recorded in his book of remembrance. If the rejection of infant baptism, leads you to utter such expressions, it is time for you to begin to retrace your steps in relation to this matter.

10. *The scriptures indirectly teach infant baptism.* What they indirectly teach is inspiration. It is as truly God's revealed will as what is more directly taught. The only difference is this. In the one case the revelation is more manifest; in the other it is less so. To ascertain what God's will is, when he teaches indirectly in his word, requires more close attention than when he uses definite language. But the instruction is no less valuable than if it was more directly communicated. When God indirectly teaches infant baptism, it ought to be as firmly believed as if it was more directly taught. It is not the manner of teaching, but the instruction, and the authority of the INSTRUCTER, which secures the belief, the love, reverence and obedience of him who takes the word of God for his only rule in all religious

duties. Infant baptism is indirectly taught in the scriptures. This a few particular cases will prove. (1.) *The Lord's supper is the New Testament Passover.* "Christ our Passover" has been "sacrificed for us."* A "bone of him shall not be broken" is equally true of the Old and New Testament paschal lamb.† In the holy supper, the Lord Jesus Christ, our paschal lamb, is sacramentally present. He teaches this truth when he says; "This is my body" in emblem; "this is my blood" emblematically exhibited to you.‡ But as the Lord's supper is the New Testament Passover, so baptism must be New Testament circumcision. New Testament believers have nothing except baptism as a substitute for circumcision. As one Old Testament sacrament is found in the holy supper, so the other must be found in baptism. Two sacraments were instituted under each dispensation of the covenant. One New Testament sacrament takes, without dispute, the place of the Passover; the other must therefore take the place of circumcision. But men first reject infant baptism and then deny that baptism takes the place of circumcision. In both these steps they substitute the wisdom of man for that of God.§ (*a*). But baptism being New Testament circumcision, it is evident that as infants were required to be circumcised when circumcision was the seal of the covenant(*b*)‖, so infants are required to be baptized when baptism is the seal of the covenant. Here therefore infant baptism is indirectly taught in God's own book. (2.) *The Jews did not find fault with Christ or with his disciples for excluding infants from their relation to the church or from the New Testament seal of the covenant.* If Christ before his death, or his disciples afterwards, had taught that infants were to be excluded from the covenant and from the use of its seal, the Jews who were constantly seeking something against them with which they could find fault, would certainly have opposed them on this account. The Israelites highly valued the seal of the covenant. They adhered to it with superstitious tenacity. To be without the seal of the covenant, or to be uncircumcised, was exceedingly reproachful in the eyes of a Jew.¶ Those who thus high-

*1 Cor. 5: 7. †Ex. 12: 46, Num. 9: 12, Ps. 34: 20, John 19: 36. ‡Mat. 26: 26. 28. §See Col. 2: 11. 12. *(a)* See § 1, par. 12. *(a)* P. i, Ch. 3, § 7. 8. ‖See Rom. 4: 11. ¶See 1 Sam. 17: 36, Acts 7: 51. 54 and 11: 2. 3.

ly valued the seal of the covenant, while they were bitter enemies of Christ and his people, would not have neglected to oppose them for refusing to infants its New Testament seal, if they had done so. On this point, the silence of the Jews is an eloquent argument in favor of infant baptism. Silence, on certain occasions, reaches the understanding and the heart. It is as eloquent as language can be; perhaps more so. The fact that the scriptures mention no instance of opposition made by the Jews against our Saviour and his disciples for excluding infants from the covenant, or from its seal, is manifestly indirect if not positive evidence, that they did not do so. Indeed, this silence proves, that malice itself could not find the least foundation upon which to build even a suspicion for such a charge against the blessed Redeemer and his inspired servants. (3.) *The baptism of adults, who were before Jews or Gentiles, is frequently mentioned in the word of God.* But not one instance is on record in that holy book, of a person being baptized in adult age, who was born of believing parents. No person can suppose that not one child of any believer was converted by the power of the holy Spirit in nearly seventy years, the time which elapsed between the death of Christ and that of John the apostle. But if any of the descendants of professing christians, became communicants in adult age, then they must have been baptized in infancy or at the time they publicly professed their faith in Christ. But if they were baptized after they had grown up, where is the evidence? The baptism of other adults is often mentioned. The baptism of the adult children of professed believers, is of as much consequence, at least, as that of heathen or Jews. Since the scriptures furnish no evidence that the adult children of professed believers were baptized, they thus indirectly teach that these, their offspring, had received that ordinance in their infancy. (4.) *The order of God's house indirectly teaches infant baptism.* The professed disciples of Christ are to learn "all things" that he has "commanded" in his word.* To do this is the business of their life. *All* that he has commanded cannot be learned in less time. As therefore they ought to be learners for life, so proper order requires that they should, in the morning of their days,

* Mat. 28: 20.

be publicly recognized as his disciples or as those who are to learn from him. They can then in proper order, be taught whatever Christ requires them to learn. A person can, with propriety, be recognized as a learner from his earliest infancy. He may be discipled in the school of Christ as soon as he enters this world of sorrow.* He may continue in that school, unless his conduct proves that he is no learner. Then, and not till then, he ought to be excluded. But he who is publicly recognized as a visible disciple or learner of Christ, has been baptized, because it is in baptism that this public recognition takes place. (5.) *The direction, "train up a child in the way he should go," indirectly teaches infant baptism.* In what way ought the child to go? From what way will he "not depart" when he is old?† In this passage we are taught to look for the aged in the same way in which they were trained up from their earliest childhood. But to be baptized members of the visible church is a part of the way in which the aged ought to be found; therefore into this part of it, as well as into others, they ought to be brought as soon as they can be; or in other words, in their infancy. But to train up children in this part of the way in which they should go, they must be baptized. Besides, the baptismal covenant relation which, in infant baptism, is publicly recognized, throws a restraining influence around the childhood and youth of those who are baptized, which preserves them from falling into many a snare. The unbaptized child is not therefore trained up "in the way" in which "he should go." (6.) *The Old Testament dispensation was not more favorable to children than that of the New is.* No intimation of this kind is contained in the scriptures. But, as under the former dispensation, infants received the seal of the covenant, so must they also in New Testament times, unless the New Testament is less favorable to infants than the Old. But as this is not the case; so therefore that infants in gospel times must be baptized, is thus indirectly taught. (7.) *The fact that in New Testament times, privileges are extended (a),‡ indirectly teaches that infants are to be baptized.* If privileges are extended in New Testament times, then, under the same dispensation,

*See Mat. 28: 19 in Greek. †Prov. 22: 6. (a) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 19. ‡See Isa, 25: 6, 7, Mat. 28: 19, 20, Acts 9: 15 and 13: 46 and 22: 21 and 26: 17.

they cannot be contracted. If believers under the gospel have more privileges than they had under the law, then they cannot at the same time have less. Believers in New Testament times cannot have both more privileges and less than were enjoyed under the former dispensation. But parents formerly had the privilege of dedicating their infant seed to God. They had the privilege of applying the seal of the covenant to them. They could ask covenant blessings from their covenant God for them. But if privileges are increased and not diminished, extended and not contracted, in New Testament times, the parent may now apply the seal of the covenant to his infant seed. He may yet ask for them the covenant blessings of their covenant God. This privilege God has not taken from his people. It therefore, since it was once theirs, belongs to them yet. God, while he has extended the privileges of adults, has not taken away those of infants. They may therefore receive the New Testament seal of the covenant. The fact therefore that the privileges of the visible church are increased in New Testament times, indirectly inculcates infant baptism. (8.) *The fact that the apostles taught that parents "ought not to circumcise their children," indirectly teaches infant baptism.** If infants were not to be circumcised, then what was to be done for them? Adults were not then to receive circumcision as the seal of the covenant, any more than infants were. But what was to be done for adults who were not to be circumcised? They were to be baptized. Then what else was to be done for infants who were not to be circumcised? The fact therefore that infants were not to be circumcised, teaches indirectly that they were to be baptized

Many circumcised persons did not, in their own persons, or in their descendants, inherit the land of Canaan. To Ishmael and to his posterity, God gave Arabia. To Esau and to his descendants, he gave Mount Seir. But to neither of these, nor to any of their posterity, did God give any inheritance in the land of Canaan. They were however all circumcised. Circumcision was not therefore necessarily connected with the temporal blessings promised in the Abrahamic covenant.† These were sure only to those with whom

*See Acts 15: 1. 21. 28 and 21: 21. †See Gen. 17: 20. 25 and 25: 16. 18 and 32: 3 and 33: 16, Deut. 2: 12. 22. 29.

the covenant was established.* Perhaps none will maintain that all circumcised persons enjoyed the spiritual blessings promised in the covenant. These were promised only to those who were or were to become interested in the atoning blood of Christ. But the unbelief and final impenitence of the wicked person who was circumcised, did not uncircumcise him. His wickedness made him a covenant-breaker, and therefore destroyed his right to the promise. But it did not, could not, destroy circumcision, the seal of the covenant. Nor does the unbelief of a baptized person destroy his baptism. It makes him a covenant-breaker, and annuls his right to the promise of the covenant. But he does not thereby become *unbaptized.* His baptism still remains as a covenant seal Divinely appointed.

Many circumcised persons did not eat the Passover. Circumcision was in use more than 400 years before the Passover was instituted.† Those Hebrews who lived during this interval, did not, *could not* eat the Passover, for it had then no existence. But during all this time the descendants of Abram were circumcised. Infants who were circumcised on the eighth day after their birth, could not for some years at least, eat the passover.‡ It is manifest therefore that the same persons who were circumcised, were not at all times, and at every age, required to eat the Passover. But "no uncircumcised person" might "eat thereof."§ It may, from these facts, be inferred that baptized persons are not at all times and at every age, required to partake of the Lord's supper. It may also be inferred from these same facts, that no unbaptized person can, without great guilt, receive the ordinance of the holy supper.

In all covenants entered into between God and man, infants have been included. Infants suffer death, the penalty threatened in the covenant made with Adam. In the covenant made with Noah, his "seed after" him are included. In that made with Abram, his "seed" are included. In the covenant made with Israel in the land of Moab, their "little ones" formed a portion of one of the parties. The covenant of grace embraces children ;‖ and in all the covenants defi-

*See Gen. 17: 19. †See Ex. 12: 40. 41, Gal. 3: 17. ‡See Gen. 17: 12, 2 Chron. 31: 16. §Ex. 12: 48. ‖Gen. 2: 16. 17 and 9: 9 and 17: 7, Deut. 29: 1. 9. 11. 12. 14. 15, Jer. 32: 39, Heb. 8: 10. 11.

nitely mentioned as having been entered into between God and man, infants form a portion of one of the parties. There is no reason why this should not be the case. There is no danger of God making hard conditions with them. They are as dear to him as adults are. They may therefore, as well as others, be received into covenant with him. But as infants form a portion of one of the parties in all covenants into which God has entered with man; so they are therefore interested in that of which baptism is a seal; and being in this covenant, they may, they ought to be, they must be, baptized.

The convert to Judaism must "circumcise all his males." To be circumcised himself was not sufficient. The command is positive; "let all his males be circumcised."* A person was not allowed to enter the Jewish church and leave his children behind, "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise."† But if he himself was permitted to enjoy the covenanted mercies of God, his children must not be left in an uncovenanted state. The convert to Judaism *must*, if he enter into covenant with God and his people, bring his children with him. He *must* apply the "token of the covenant" to them.‡ If the convert to Judaism *must* bring his children with him, *must* the convert to christianity be compelled to leave his dear little ones to the uncovenanted mercies of God? *Must he* be compelled to part from his children when he enters into covenant with the God of Abram? No; this cannot be, is the language of every feeling of humanity and of true religion. Infants therefore ought to be baptized. From what is mentioned in this section, it is clear that the scriptures indirectly teach the doctrine of infant baptism.

CHAPTER III.

SCRIPTURAL EXAMPLES OF INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *The baptism of Israel in the cloud and in the sea, furnishes many examples of infant baptism.* When the nation of Israel was baptized in the cloud and in the sea, it may have contained five millions of persons. It certainly con-

*Ex. 12: 48. †Eph. 2: 12. ‡Gen. 17: 11.

tained more than half that number(*a*). That the nation of Israel like all other nations, included infants, is also an undeniable fact(*b*). It is expressly stated that "they," their "young," their "sons" and "daughters," their "little ones," their "children" who "had no knowledge between good and evil," went out of Egypt and through the opening which God made in the sea.* These were all "baptized—in the cloud and in the sea"—for "examples" to New Testament believers.† Even the Jews themselves, hardened as they are in unbelief, admit that their whole nation was baptized in the sea(*c*). In this nation, probably composed of five millions of persons, about one in five was an infant. Of infants and little children, this proportion is usually found in communities. About on fifth part of any civilized nation is in a state of infancy or early childhood. There were therefore in all probability in the whole nation of Israel, about one million of infants. In the baptism of the whole nation, about one million of infants were therefore baptized in the cloud, and about the same number in the sea. But to keep entirely within the limits of certainty on the subject, the whole number baptized in the cloud and in the sea, may be set down at two millions five hundred thousand. If of these only one in ten, instead of one in five, was an infant, then there would have been two hundred and fifty thousand infants baptized in the cloud, and the same number in the sea. It is manifest therefore that at least five hundred thousand infants were baptized in both the cloud and sea. Besides, it may be remarked that in all reasonable probability, there were one million of infants baptized in the cloud and the same number in the sea. This estimate would make the number of cases of infant baptism amount to about two millions in all. Here are examples of infant baptism by the million for those who desire to attend to them.

2. *The examples of infants baptized by John are numerous.* John baptized infants(*d*). He probably baptized not less than two millions five hundred thousand persons(*e*). If one in five of these was an infant, he then must have baptized five hundred thousand infants. But if he baptized only

(*a*) See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 2, § 5. (*b*) See Ch. 1, § 5. *Ex. 10: 9. 10. 24 and 13: 20 and 14: 11. 12. 22, Num. 14: 31. 33, Dent. 1: 39. †1 Cor. 10: 2. 6. (*c*) See W. Wall. (*d*) See Ch. 2, § 4. (*e*) See B. ii, P. i, Ch. 7, § 6.

one million of persons, and only one in ten of these was an infant, even then he must have baptized one hundred thousand infants. That John baptized infants, is as definitely taught, as it is that he baptized adults. He baptized "Jerusalem and all Judea," and "all the region round about Jordan."* This language necessarily includes both infants and adults. Both, in every region of country, form together, the whole population. To say that God, in his word, uses language which necessarily *in*cludes infants, when he intends to *ex*clude them, is what no christian will do. In John's baptism therefore, we have very many examples of infants who were baptized.

Moreover, it may be observed that Ambrose, about the year 374, and Augustine about the year 390, both affirm that John baptized infants(*a*). That John baptized many infants is therefore manifest.

3. *Examples of infant baptism are required by the commission which Christ gave to his ministering servants.* The standing command which it contains, is; "teach" or disciple "all nations, baptizing them(*b*).† The various nations of the earth at any one time embrace from six hundred to ten hundred millions of persons of all ages and of both sexes. If one fifth part of these are infants then the world contains from one hundred and twenty to two hundred millions of infants; and if only one in ten of the inhabitants of the globe is an infant, then there are at any one time on earth, from sixty to one hundred millions of infants. This commission contains a standing command to baptize all nations. These probably contain one hundred millions, and certainly not less than sixty millions of infants. Here therefore we have the standing command of Christ, which requires from sixty to a hundred millions of infants to be baptized. Here therefore are a multitude of examples of infant baptism. It may also be a fact that this command requires at least two hundred millions of infants to be this day baptized. When this command is completely obeyed, even in the external act, at least sixty millions of infants will be baptized in every age. This ministerial commission therefore embraces millions of examples of infant baptism.

*Mat. 3: 5. 6. (*a*) See W. Wall. (*b*) See Ch. 2, § 5. †See Mat. 28: 19 in Greek.

4. *Examples of infant baptism are found in the families which inspired men baptized.* The commission by which they were authorized to administer christian baptism, required them to baptize infants(*a*). They did not disobey the injunction which it contained. They baptized many families. Eight of these are named; and many were evidently baptized, which are not expressly named(*b*). They baptized "all" the "house" of Cornelius,—the house or "household" of Lydia, the "house"—"all" the "house" of the Philippian jailer,* and many others. That these families included infants, is certain; because a word (οικος) which primarily signifies infant children, is used for family in every instance where the baptism of the household is mentioned. The Greek word (πανοικι) which denotes all the house, the whole household is used in the Greek Old Testament, when infants, "little ones," the "sons' sons" and the "sons' daughters" of Jacob are intended.† The same Greek word (πανοικι) is used of the jailer's house or family which was baptized. As infants are certainly included when this word is used of Jacob's descendants; so it must as certainly include infants when it is used of the jailer's descendants. If it is said that infants are *ex*cluded from the word when it is used of the jailer's family, men of sense will ask at least a very little evidence to support the assertion. In this therefore and in the other families the baptism of which is mentioned in the word of God, we have more examples of infant baptism. To suppose one infant or little child to a family is not too great an average. The baptism of eight families definitely mentioned as taking place after the resurrection of Christ, furnishes therefore eight more examples of infant baptism to the millions already mentioned. Moreover, it is probable that not less than eight thousand families were baptized, which are not definitely named in the word of God(*b*). These will give a probable increase of eight thousand more examples of infant baptism, for those who will not be satisfied with millions.

5. *An indefinite number of examples of infants having been baptized, is mentioned in the New Testament.* Besides those already noticed, every individual, who is, in the New Tes-

(*a*) See Ch. 2, § 5. (*b*) See Ch. 2, § 6. *Acts 10: 2. 47. 48 and 16: 14. 15. 31. 34 in Greek. †Gen. 46: 5. 7, Ex. 1: 1 in Greek.

tament, publicly recognized as a church member, must have been baptized. An indefinite number of publicly recognized church members, and who must, as such have been baptized, are addressed by the appellation of (τεκνια) "little children."* This Greek word is a diminutive derived from another (τεκνον) which signifies a child, a young child, and sometimes a child unborn(*a*). This original word (τεκνιον) must therefore denote a very little child and in the plural (τεκνια) very "little children." When therefore the Spirit of God by the apostle addresses an indefinite number of members in the "churches" in "Galatia"† by the expression "little children," more examples are thus furnished of infant baptism. These "little children" are addressed as publicly recognized church members and therefore as having been baptized. Here are some examples of infants or very "little children" having been baptized in apostolic times, and having been so recognized by inspired men. The number of these examples cannot easily be determined; nor is this a matter of great importance.

The epistle to the Galatians was written about the year 58, not far from 25 years after the resurrection of Christ. Galatia was a country of some considerable extent. In it during this 25 years, 40 or 50 or even 100 churches might have been planted by the apostles and other ministers of Christ. But if it contained only twenty churches, each embracing one hundred members; then in the "churches of Galatia," there were, when the epistle was written to them, two thousand members. If one fifth part of these were "little children," as it is positively stated some of them were, then in these churches, there were five hundred "little children" who had been baptized; for these "little children" were addressed as publicly recognized or baptized church members. But the number of "little children" in these churches, could not well be less than one hundred.

Moreover, John the apostle, in an epistle addressed to the churches in general, calls an indefinite number of their publicly recognized or baptized members, (τεκνια) "little children," and (παιδια) young "children." But all these "little children," young "children" must have been baptized

*Gal. 4: 19 in Gr. and Eng. (*a*) See Ch. 2, § 7. †Gal. 1: 2.

or they could not have been publicly recognized as church members. These "little children" could not have been metaphorical. This is manifest from the fact that they are mentioned as composing one portion of the persons to whom he wrote; while "young men" and "fathers" composed other portions of them.* He also mentions these "little children" between the "young men" and "fathers." The directions which he gives to them differ in some respects from those given to the other church members.† In this way, he prevents his plain language from being forced into a metaphor by those who would rather alter the word of God itself, than take it for a rule, when it does not correspond with their previously conceived opinions. They cannot make these children metaphorical or figurative, unless they are determined to be self-deceivers. In this epistle therefore, the apostle John furnishes an indefinite number of examples of infants or "little children" who had been baptized; for by baptism and by that only, could they be publicly acknowledged as members of the church in New Testament times.

John wrote his first epistle about the year 90, nearly or quite 57 years after the death of Christ. At that date the number of members composing the visible church was probably not less than five hundred thousand(*a*). If one fifth part of these were "little children," then when John addressed his first epistle to the churches, they must have contained in all one hundred thousand "little children." But to keep entirely within the limits of certainty on this subject, the whole number of publicly acknowledged church members may be set down at three hundred thousand. If only one in ten of these was a little child, then the whole number of "little children" who were publicly acknowledged and therefore baptized, church members, must have been at least thirty thousand. The apostle John therefore furnishes an indefinite number of examples of infant baptism. This number could not be less than thirty thousand. He positively teaches that at least this number of infants or "little children" had been baptized. When therefore examples of infant baptism are called for, hundreds, thousands, millions are at hand.

*1 John 2: 1. 12–14. 18. 28 in Greek and Eng. † See 1 John 2: 12–14. *(a)* See Ch. 2, § 6.

6. *The examples of infant baptism may be summed up.* When this is done, the number of infants certainly and probably baptized, as well as that of those to whom the ordinance is commanded to be administered, will be very great.

Examples of Infants certainly baptized ;

In the cloud,	250,000
In the sea the same,	250,000
John baptized,	100,000
Jesus Christ commands the baptism of	60,000,000
In families certainly more than	8
In Galatia,	100
Addressed by John as being baptized,	30,000
These amount to	60,630,108

Examples of Infants probably baptized ;

In the cloud,	1,000,000
In the sea the same,	1,000,000
John baptized,	500,000
Jesus Christ commands the baptism of	120,000,000 or 200,000,000
In families probably more than	8,000
In Galatia,	500
Addressed by John as probably baptized,	1,000,000(*a*)
These amount to	122,608,500 or 202,608,500

These examples of infant baptism will be sufficient to satisfy those who can be satisfied with the word of God. But those who are not pleased with Divine instruction, will have to change "little children" into adults. They must also, by some new-coined legerdemain, banish infants from families and nations. If they find this to be a task too difficult for their inventive genius, they might so re-model the scriptures as to leave out of their copies all those "infants" and "little children" that now trouble their consciences so very much. What true believer in Divine revelation, can, after examining these examples of infant baptism so definitely recognized in the word of God, turn away and say ; there is no example of infant baptism mentioned in the scriptures?

(a) See for all these § 1–5.

A person might, with equal propriety, deny that examples of adult baptism are recorded by inspired men(*a*).

(a) In the year 1811, a little book entitled "Letters on Christian Baptism," appeared before the public. It was written by a Mr. Bliss. To those who read it with care, several things will be manifest. (1.) To them it will be evident that its author has taken most of the names and dates contained in his work, from books of reference; and that, for the principal part of what it contains besides, he has drawn on his own inventive powers. (2.) That the writer's knowledge is not *too extensive*, will also appear evident. His whole book, with its frequent repetitions and, abounding as it does, with low words and phrases, proves that he is not, by any means, too well acquainted with the structure of the English language. Of the verb *is*, he says, (p. 100,) it is future. This writer who mistakes the present for the future tense of an English verb, asserts (p. 70,) that the grammatical construction of Acts 2: 39, shows that the promise which is there mentioned, is that of the Holy Ghost. He calls on men (p. 73,) to disprove his assertions. These few references to his book out of many which might be made, will show to those acquainted with those subjects that he is not overstocked with a knowledge of English grammar or with the principles of argumentation. It may also be remarked here that he does not condescend to prove or to attempt to prove, by proper evidence, any one of the assertions which he makes. 'I say so or some other person says so,' is the amount of proof by which he undertakes to sustain his various assertions. He does not appear to know the difference between *question* and *test*, *saved* and *protected*, *in* and *under*, *baptize* and *immerse*, &c. (p. 50. 171. 216.) He has made a number of left-handed attempts to correct the translation of the scriptures (p. 46. 51. 52. 68. 100. 107. 108. 165. 171. 210–219.) These show that he can have but a mere school-boy's knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. The word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, he repeatedly asserts, (p. 17. 171,) always denotes immerse. A little knowledge of Greek would have led him out of such a mistake, and would have taught him that the connection does not, in any passage of scripture, necessarily require immerse to be its signification. He might easily have learned that classical writers frequently use this word in such connections as to render it impossible for immerse to be its meaning. He might also have learned with a little study, that no word for immerse, no, not even one of those (ενδυω, ενδυνω or ενδυομαι) which in Greek frequently denote to *go under*, is used to define or describe that (βαπτιζω) for baptize. He affirms (p. 68. 108. 171,) that the word (εν) often and properly translated *with*, always signifies in, and he intimates that it conveys to the mind the idea of immersion. On this assertion see Luke 21: 23. 25. 34 and 23: 12 and 24: 30, John 2: 23 and 7: 11. 22. 23. 43. and 12: 20, Rom. 1: 4. 5 and 2: 24 and 5: 10. 21 and 6: 11. 23 and 8: 11 and 12: 7. 8. &c. in Greek and English. In each of these passages, this word (εν) is used. In some of them it evidently signifies *with*, in others *at*, in others *on*, *among*, *by*, &c. The writer of said book, by his mode of altering the translation of the scriptures, might easily assert that the Jews made *straw out of brick*, that *Jonah swallowed the whale*, or that *James killed Herod*. Those who understand only the first principles of Latin, will easily perceive how much he knows of that language when they see that he gives (p. 90. 123. 153. 159.) *imperinus* as the plural of *imperium*. His knowledge of military movements, of appointing officers, (p. 125. 127,) of high treason, (p. 158. 159,) and of history (p. 193–195. 199. 200. 105,) is about equal to his acquaintance with the learned languages, (3.) The untrue statements and misrepresentations which said book contains, are numerous and glaring. Out of the hundreds of these which are found in it, only a very few can here be noticed. Some of these relate to the meanings which Greek Lexicons and other books give of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize, (p. 15–18. 210.) Others of them relate to the baptismal fonts and Episcopal ritual used in England, to the fundamental articles of the English church, the Westminster Assembly, the reason why the Romanists persecuted the Waldenses, &c. (p. 31. 39. 41. 85. 194. 199.) These are only a mere specimen of the incorrect statements which it contains. A very few of its assertions which all know or may easily know to be untrue will now be mentioned. Said book asserts that the Old School Presbyterians hold that the human soul is material, (p. 122;) that Baptists are not close communionists, (p. 22;) that John Calvin styles himself that famous, learned, godly man, (p. 166;) that those who baptize infants by sprinkling are perfectly crazy, (p. 132,) deranged, perfect maniacs, &c. (p. 61–65. 91. 135;) that Papists say that infants have no souls till they are sprinkled, (p. 94;) that the

PART FOURTH.

HUMAN AUTHORITY IN FAVOR OF INFANT BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY CHRISTIANS ON INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *Early christian writers teach the doctrine of infant baptism.* Those christians who wrote between the apostolic age and about the year 450 or 500, may be denominated early christian writers. An unbroken line of such writers will here be presented to the mind. They inculcate infant baptism. They begin before the death of John the apostle, and continue on till about the year 500 after Christ. (1.) Ignatius was born 12 years before the death of Christ. He says; "truly did I see him after his resurrection"(*a*). He

(a) See Dr. Robert Bayfeild's Bulwark of Truth, p. 63, Newcastle Ed. 1804.

Baptists have been persecuted in all ages, (p. 200. 205;) that books containing facts are withdrawn from those who grow up in the belief that infants ought to be baptized by sprinkling, (p. 98;) that all new sects sprinkle, (p. 60;) that Luther in his translation of the Dutch Testament (he probably means the German as this is the language into which Luther translated the scriptures,) renders the word for baptism in every case by one which signifies immersion and that alone, (p. 82) &c. It may be remarked here, that in the German language, there are four words (*tauchen, eintauchen, untertauchen* and *verscuten,*) which usually signify to immerse or to put under water or under some other substance. Luther, in his translation of the New Testament, does not, at any time, use these words, or any one of them, to denote baptize or baptism. He, for this purpose, uses another word which has already been defined, (See B. ii, P. ii, Ch. 1, § 3.) It may also be observed that it is a well known fact that the Mormons, Millerites, Chrystians, Campbellites, &c. are sects of very recent origin. People are also generally aware that these all practice immersion and reject infant baptism. (1.) This said book contains rather fanciful views of christian character. Its writer charges those who baptize infants by sprinkling, with being guilty of treasonable crimes of the deepest dye, of heaven-daring atrocities, of high treason against heaven, of dethroning and robbing God, of cheating Christ, of committing a vast amount of wickedness, of pious frauds, swindling, rebellion, false and foul slander, &c. He calls them perfect fools, catspaws, immoral, profane, proud, deceptive, persecuting usurpers, &c. He declares that they are guilty of stealing in open day for the glory of God, of being as bad as sheep thieves, of practicing theft under the cloak of religion, of lying, of witchcraft, of being ravening wolves, of felony, of the greatest heaven-daring crime that can be committed, of deserving the punishment of death, of mocking Christ's ordinance, of laying snares and traps, of practicing stratagems, &c. He also declares that the conduct of these persons has done more harm to the cause of religion than any device of satan, (p. 15. 26 28. 31. 36. 47. 62. 65. 73. 82. 90. 91. 95. 106. 110. 123. 129. 143. 152-156. 158. 161. 200. 207.) It might be supposed that no human being after describing persons in such language as is here quoted, would pretend that they were any thing but the vilest of profligates. But this Mr. Pliability is such a liberal minded man and so easily bent from one thing to another, that, after dealing out a large amount of language only a mere specimen of which is given here, calls these same persons whom he thus describes, most lovely, excellent, honest, hearty, devoted, dear, fellow-christians!!!! (p. 64. 106. 117. 151. 192. 222.) He says they have pious, devoted, good hearts!!!! (p. 58. 62 117. 151.) He must certainly think that what he calls most lovely christians are the most odious wretches living, or he cannot believe his own assertions. If *his fellow*-christians are such characters as he describes them to be, then it is certainly time for honest men to be on their guard. For giving such a book or its writer even this passing notice, an apology is due to the reader. That some few *immersers* may be deceived by it, is possible. The hope of saving them from such a delusion, is the only apology that can be offered for writing this note.

was martyred in the year 107, at the age of 86. (2.) Clement of Rome, lived about the year 100. (3.) Polycarp was born in A. D. 67. He lived more than 30 years before John's death. Moreover, he was a disciple or scholar of that apostle. He suffered martyrdom when he was about 100 years of age, in A. D. 167. (4.) Ireneus was born in the year 97. He was a disciple of Polycarp, and was his cotemporary about 70 years. What he declares will therefore extend from the days of the apostle John till his own death, which occurred about the year 203. In the year 167, Ireneus says; "infants, little ones, children, youth and persons of mature age, were re-born to God; that is, set apart to his service by baptism." He again urges the propriety of infant baptism from the fact that Christ came to save "infants, little ones, children, youths," and "older persons." Moreover, he declares positively that "the church learned from the apostles to baptize infants"(*a*). This language puts the matter of infant baptism beyond dispute so far as his authority is concerned. Nor does any one of his cotemporaries say aught against these, his positive declarations in favor of infant baptism. It is therefore manifest that none of them embraced the modern anti-pedobaptist notions(*b*); or rejected the doctrine of infant baptism. (5.) Justin Martyr was born and lived sometime before the death of two or more of the apostles. This he himself teaches when he says he was a "disciple of the apostles." The word *apostles* certainly includes two or more. About the year 139, not far from 40 years after the death of the apostle John, he wrote an apology for the christians. He suffered martyrdom in A. D. 163. He says; "several persons among us—60 or 70 years old—were *matheteusated*" or discipled "in childhood." He here uses the same word which our Saviour employs in the commission to baptize, and which is translated "teach.* (*d*). To say that they were discipled in childhood is merely one way of saying they were baptized in infancy. But those persons who were 60 or 70 years of age, 40 years after the death of John the apostle, must have been born about the year 70 or 80; that is, 20 or 30 years before John died. Here therefore this "disciple of the apostles,"

(*a*) Ad. Haeres B. 2, Ch. 39. W. Wall. (*b*) An anti-pedobaptist is one who opposes infant baptism. *See Mat. 28: 19 in Greek. (*c*) See Apol. 1, and Ske. Sect. No. 3.

this martyr, positively teaches that infants were baptized at least 20 years before the death of the apostle John. (6.) Clement of Alexandria, was born about the year 120. He was for more than 20 years the cotemporary of Justin Martyr. He also lived several years before Ireneus died. He wrote about the year 190. He also teaches the doctrine of infant baptism(*a*), though his language on this subject is not so definite as that of some other early writers. (7.) Tertullian was born about the year 147. He lived in Africa, and died about A. D. 230. He was the best Latin scholar of the age in which he lived. He was a cotemporary of Ireneus for more than 50 years. He says "that our Saviour commanded little children to be baptized;"—that "if either parent were a christian, the children were enrolled in Jesus Christ by baptism,"—that infants "are holy, because they are designed for holiness in baptism, the privilege of descent from a church member." But notwithstanding these admissions, he advises the delay of infant baptism in certain cases. He even seems, in some expressions, to oppose the practice then universal in the church of baptizing infants. But whether he opposes infant baptism or advises the delay of it, he does not intimate that its origin was then recent or that it was not an apostolic institution(*b*). If it had been a human invention, or at that time recently introduced, he certainly would have mentioned both. He wrote not far from the year 200 and less than one hundred years from the death of John the apostle. A man of his learning must have been so well acquainted with the subject of baptism, on which he wrote, as to have known what was the practice of the christian church in relation to that ordinance for one or two centuries. But he admits that to baptize infants was the practice of the christian church in his day, and that it was of Divine origin. The very fact that he, in certain cases, advises its delay, shows that the practice did exist; for no man would advise the delay of that which no person practiced. This, his testimony then is complete in favor of the fact that infant baptism was practiced in his day, and that its origin was Divine. (8.) Origen was a presbyter of Alexandria. He was born about the year 175, and died at Tyre about the

(*a*) See Pedag. B. 3, C. 11. (*b*) See Ter. on bap. C. 18, and his remarks on 1 Cor. 7: 14.

year 250. He therefore lived with Tertullian about half a century, and with Ireneus nearly 30 years(*a*). He wrote about A. D. 212. He visited the churches planted by the apostles in Capadocia and Arabia, in Greece and Rome ; but he spent most of his life in Syria and Palestine. His father was a christian martyr. His grand-father also was a christian. Being born about 75 years after the death of John the apostle, and about 8 or 10 years after Polycarp's martyrdom, his father and grand-father must have been the cotemporaries of Polycarp, and the latter at least must have lived part of his life with John. What therefore Origen declares as to matters of fact, will come to us almost like a message from the apostles sent by a special messenger. He declares that "the church received the injunction from the apostles to give baptism—to infants ;"—that "baptism is given to infants ;"—that "the custom of baptizing infants was received from Christ and his apostles"(*b*). Such language cannot be mistaken or perverted. (9.) Cyprian was born about A. D. 180. He was the pastor of the church in Carthage in Africa, and suffered martyrdom in the year 257 or 258. He was the cotemporary of Origen for about 70 years. He was president of a council of ministers which was held at Carthage in A. D. 253, only three or four years before he suffered death for his religion. This council was composed of 66 ministers, many of whom had suffered mutilation for the sake of Christ. Of the members of this council of martyrs, some had been deprived of an arm, some of a leg, some of an eye, some of an ear, some of the nose, &c. But there was scarcely one of them who had not been called to suffer for Christ as well as to believe in him. Fidus the pastor of a church near Carthage, desired this council to say whether an infant might or might not be baptized before the eighth day after its birth. He had supposed that an infant, only two or three days old, ought not to be baptized. His opinion seems to have been that its baptism should be deferred till it had become at least eight days old. But this council unanimously decided that an infant might be baptized before the eighth day after its birth(*c*). In the mind of Fidus or in the

(*a*)Some place his birth and death a few years earlier and some a few years later than the dates here given. (*b*)See his Hom. 8 on Lev. C. 12; Hom. on Luke C. 14; Com. on Rom. B 5. (*c*)See Let. 66 to Fidus, See also Miller on baptism, p. 21-31; Milner's Eccl. Hist. v. i, p. 401; Marsh's Eccs. Hist.

minds of the members of this council, no doubt existed as to the propriety of infant baptism. All its members, without hesitation, admitted that infants ought to be baptized. The only question for the council to decide was this; may infants, or may they not, be baptized before the eighth day after their birth? This point was easily decided and the decision was unanimous. This council sat about 150 years after the death of John the apostle. Their mutilated bodies bore testimony to the sincerity of their faith. The time in which they lived and their number shows that they must have known what the practice of the church then was, and what it had been from the apostolic age. This council therefore teaches unanimously that it was then, and always had been, the practice of the christian church to baptize infants. (10.) Ambrose was born about the year 245, and died about the year 335(*a*). He wrote about the year 270 or 280. He says; "the baptism of infants was practiced by the apostles,"—and again "infants—are baptized"(*b*). This language clearly teaches the fact that in his day infants were baptized. (11.) Gregory Nazianzen was born about the year 330, and wrote about the year 360. He, in some of his writings, advises that the baptism of healthy children be delayed till they are about three years old. But in others he teaches the contrary. He says; "hast thou an infant child? let him be dedicated from his cradle." He also teaches that Bazil was baptized in infancy. Moreover, it may be observed that in the case of his own children, he delayed their baptism till they were nearly or quite three years of age. But both he and Tertullian, whenever they mention this subject, insist that weakly infants should be baptized at an early day after their birth; though they advised, for certain reasons which they supposed to be prudential, that the baptism of others should be delayed. Both these men therefore prove that it was the practice of christians in their day to baptize infants. (12.) Optatus, about the year 360, Bazil, about the year 370, Sericius, about 384, Jerome, about 390, Paulinus, about 393, and Theodoret, about 440, all teach that infant baptism was practiced in their day. (13.) Chrysostom was born in the year 354, and died in A. D. 407.

(*a*) Some say he lived a few years later than these dates. (*b*) See his com. on Luke B. 1, C. 1.

He became pastor of the church in Constantinople in the year 398, nine years before his death. He says of baptism, a person may receive it "in the very beginning of his age;" and of "those—baptized" on a certain occasion, he says; "some of them were infants." Moreover, he affirms; "our circumcision, I mean—baptism, gives cure without pain, and this to infants as well as men." He also teaches that "the church—every where declared that infants should be baptized;" and to a person he says; "thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized." Besides all this, in a public sermon, he "urged the duty of infant baptism"(*a*). Chrysostom is therefore very pointed and full in favor of infant baptism. (14.) Augustine was born about the year 330, was converted to christianity about the year 354, and died about the year 420. He became pastor of the church at Hippo in Africa, about A. D. 398. He declares; "a little while ago when I was at Carthage, I—heard—some people—saying that infants were not baptized for the remission of sins, but they were baptized that they may be sanctified in Christ." Here the fact that infant baptism was the common practice of the church is mentioned as that which was universally known and admitted. He also affirms that infant baptism was not instituted by councils but was always in use;—he mentions "baptized infants;"—he says; "the custom of—the church in baptizing infants must not be disregarded;"—the Pelagians(*b*) "grant that infants must be baptized;" and he also positively declares that he "never heard or read of any christian, catholic or sectarian, who did not hold that infants were to be baptized." He might well make this remark, because in the age in which he lived, no one had denied infant baptism; and only two had then maintained that in certain cases, it ought to be, or might be delayed(*c*). Thus this great opposer of Pelagianism in its origin clearly teaches the doctrine of infant baptism. Augustine, in more than a thousand passages in his writings, teaches infant bap-

(*a*)See Hom. 40 on Gen. and Hom. 23 on the Acts, &c. Fonda p. 95. (*a*)These were the followers of Pelagius. He was an unprincipled heretic. He wrote about the year 410. When it was said that his doctrines militated against infant baptism, he declared that though he had visited almost every part of christendom, he had never so much as "heard" of "any—heretic" who was so "ignorant" and "impious as to hinder infants from being baptized." Even Pelagius, that arch impostor, calls the denial of infant baptism "impious!!" See his Let. to Inno. against Aug.; his work on Orig. Sin C. 17. (*c*)See his work on Bap. B. 4. C. 23; Epist. 28. 57; on sin, &c. C. 26; Against Pela. B. 3, C. 10; On Gen. B. 10.

tism(*a*). Such an amount of authority is truly irresistible. (15.) Epiphanius, in the year 370, quotes the "Apostolic Constitutions." The author of these is not known. But the statements which they contain show the practice of the christian church in the fourth century. These, as quoted by Epiphanius, say; "baptize your children." By these ancient christian writers the practice of baptizing infants is traced in an unbroken historical line from before the death of some of the apostles, till the beginning of the fifth century.

Moreover, it may be observed here, that Ireneus, about the year 176, wrote an account of all the professedly christian sects which had sprung up between the death of Christ and his own time. Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 370, describes eighty sects of professing christians. These he says, are "all the sects of christians that" he had "ever heard of in the world." Austin or Augustine, about the year 400, mentions eighty-eight sects; and Philostrius, shortly after this, enumerates one hundred different sects. He made a sect out of the least difference of opinion about any trifling matter. Theodoret wrote his account of heresies about the year 430. It is a very "learned, methodical, particular and full" treatise on this subject. But in *no one of these catalogues, is there to be found the least intimation of any (except such as denied water baptism altogether,) who did not hold to the baptism of infants as a Divine institution.*" In "all these catalogues, the differences of opinion which" existed "in primitive ages" on the subject of baptism, "are particularly mentioned" and carefully described. But however much they differed in other respects, they all held to infant baptism as an ordinance of God's appointment. None, who believed in baptism with water, denied or pretended to doubt that infant baptism was a Divine institution. Such facts as these, speak a language which, one would suppose, might make an impression on the mind even of an immerser(*b*).

2. *Children were recognized as baptized church members in both the Greek and Latin churches.* By both they are frequently said to be "holy" and "faithful." These words are, in the scriptures, used of church members(*c*). When

(*a*) See W. Wall. (*b*) See Eells on Bap. p. 41. 42. (*c*) See P. iii, Ch. 1, § 7.

therefore, early christians, in both the Greek and Latin churches, in speaking of the infant children of believers, use concerning them, the same words which they and the scriptures use of adult church members; no evidence can be more conclusive than this is, that they considered them as in visible covenant relation with God as really as their parents were. But if they viewed them as being in covenant, they must in consistency, have viewed them as being entitled to the ordinance of christian baptism, if it had not been administered to them(*a*).

The baptism in adult age of any descendant of parents who were professed believers, does not appear on the page of early ecclesiastical history. The case of Constantine the Great, who was baptized just before his death, is not an exception; because his father was not a christian but a heathen.

3. *Commemorative inscriptions show that the early christians baptized infants.* A considerable number of these have been examined(*b*). Only a very few need be noticed here. (1.) "Posthumius," was "a believer" who "lived six years"(*c*). A word which describes church members, is here applied to a child six years old. He is called a believer or a faithful. He was therefore a publicly recognized or baptized church member. This inscription is not dated; but the symbol in early Greek characters(*d*), placed above and on the left side of it, shows that its date could not have been much if any later than the year 150. (2.) "Here lies Zosimus a believer, descended from ancestors who were believers. He lived two years one month and twenty-five days." This child could not possibly be any thing more than a ritual believer, or a baptized church member. (3.) "Leopardus rests here in peace with holy spirits;—he received baptism" and "lived seven years and seven months." This monumental inscription was written about the year 290. (4.) "Achillia, newly baptized(*e*), is buried here. She died at the age of one year and five months." (5.)

(*a*) See Fabrittius. (*b*) By Fabrittius, Muratorius, Arringhius, and others. (*c*) The word believer must here be descriptive of church-membership. (*d*) This is ΙΧΘC which denotes a fish. The last character is not used by the later Greek writers. (*e*) The Greek word is νεοφυτος. It denotes recently planted or received into the christian faith by baptism.

"Maureutius—lived five years eleven months and two days." He was "worthy to repose in peace among holy persons." (6.) "Cervonia" is "gone" to enjoy happiness "with holy spirits." This inscription is dated A. D. 291. (7.) "Julia reposes in peace among holy persons"(*a*). The words *holy* and *in peace* indicate that these three last named children were baptized church members. (8.) "Cyriacus, a believer, died" when he was "eight days less than three years of age." (9.) "Polichronio, a believer—lived three years." (10.) "Urcia Florentina, a believer—lived five years eight months and eight days." (11.) "Rufillo, newly baptized—lived two years and forty days." (12.) "Domitius, newly baptized—lived three years and thirty days." (13.) The son of Vilerius—"newly baptized—lived three years ten months and fifteen days." (14.) "Pisentus—lived one year eight months and thirteen days." He was "newly baptized." (15.) "Jovius—lived six years ten months and nineteen days." He was "newly baptized." (16.) "Aristus—lived eight months." He was "newly baptized." (17.) "Libna—lived eight years." She was "newly baptized." (18.) "Flavia Jovina—lived three years and thirty-two days." She was "newly baptized." This inscription is dated A. D. 367. (19.) "Two brothers—newly baptized—lived eight years two months and six days;" also, "Justus, a believer—lived seven years." This is dated A. D. 394. (20.) "Pascasius lived six years and received baptism." This child died in the year 463(*b*). These are a few of the inscriptions on the tombs of infants and children. They are much abbreviated. Only the age of the child and its baptism are mentioned. They speak a language that cannot be misunderstood. They teach that, at the time of their dates, infant baptism was practiced in the christian church. The testimony of these inscriptions comes to us like a voice from the unseen world. Infant baptism must have been practiced at the time of their dates; for if it had not been, no parent or friend would have written such inscriptions. Thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of the infant children of christian parents, of whom no memento is preserved, must have died in the early ages of the church. Of those concerning whom some memorial remains, very few com-

(*a*) This inscription is in Greek. (*b*) See Taylor on Baptism.

paratively, have been examined. But the testimony of these few in favor of infant baptism, is pointed, plain, convincing, unanswerable.

4. *Later ecclesiastical writers teach infant baptism.* Not one writer from and after the year 360, so much as advises the delay of infant baptism, till about the year 1140. About the year 200, Tertullian who supposed that sins committed after baptism were nearly or quite unpardonable, did, for that and several similar reasons which he called prudential, advise the delay of this ordinance in certain cases. For the same reasons, he held that healthy youths should delay their baptism till after their marriage. But notwithstanding this notion, he maintained that unhealthy infants and all who were not expected to live long, should, by all means, be baptized. About the year 360, Gregory, though for different reasons, advises the delay of infant baptism, till children should arrive at the age of about three years(*a*). This delay, it is said, he practiced in the case of his own children. But not one writer whose works have, in any form, reached the present day, either opposed infant baptism, or advised its delay, for more than 750 years after A. D. 360. All who mention the subject during this interval, speak in favor of infant baptism. Moreover, to baptize infants, is frequently mentioned as the universal practice of the christian church. All the christian writers therefore in the whole christian world for more than 750 years from and after the year 360, teach the doctrine of infant baptism. And before that year, all inculcated the same doctrine ; because even the two who advised its delay in particular cases, were in favor of it under other circumstances. The first professing christians who opposed infant baptism, were a small sect which originated in the year 1110, and continued till about the year 1150(*b*). This sect rejected infant baptism, because those who composed it, imagined that infants could not be saved. For more than 350 years after these few followers of Peter De Bruys dwindled away and disappeared, no one opposed

(*a*) See § 1, Nos. 7. 11. (*b*) This was a small sect which arose in France among the Waldenses. They were called Petrobrussians after Peter De Bruys, their founder. They were also called Henricians after Henry the disciple of Peter. He led them for a time after the death of their founder. This sect was very small. They held that infants could not be saved. On this ground they refused to baptize them. The Waldenses as a body, rejected the notion of the Petrobrussians. After Henry's death, this little sect soon disappeared.

infant baptism. All who mention it, speak in its favor, and represent it as the universal practice of the visible church. The true church then was and had been for centuries before, among the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., who resided in the south of France, in the north of Italy, and were scattered more or less in the neighboring countries. For more than a thousand years after the death of Christ, not one writer of any description, whose works have reached our day, has intimated in any form of words, that infants were not to be baptized(*a*). Every writer who mentions this subject during all this time, teaches that infants ought to be baptized. Even Tertullian and Gregory teach this doctrine. In the year 1524 or 1525, the German Anabaptists commenced their outrages against all law, all true religion, all morality(*b*). For three or four years before this date, they had manifested something of the spirit of anarchy. About the year 1538, these ignorant, lawless, licentious fanatics, came forward and, in the face of the christian world, rejected infant baptism. From that time till the present day, infant baptism has been rejected by many immersers, by quakers, &c., and it has been advocated and practiced by all other professing christians. The later writers therefore on ecclesiastical matters, clearly teach that the church has been accustomed to baptize infants from the days of the early fathers till our own time.

In this chapter an unbroken historical chain has been presented to the reader's mind. No link has been omitted. This historical evidence commenced before the death of John the apostle. It extends till the year 1844. During the first eleven hundred years after the death of Christ, not one writer opposes infant baptism as such. And during these eleven centuries, only two writers advised its delay in certain cases. All who wrote in relation to the subject, gave it their approbation as of Divine origin. More than eleven hundred years after the death of our Saviour, a little sect arose which continued for a few years and then ceased to exist. This sect denied baptism to infants on the ground that, in the nature of things their salvation was impossible. The baptism of infants met with no other opposition till more than fifteen

(*a*) See Ch. Ob. Eells on Bap. p. 42. (*b*) See B. ii, P. iv, Ch. 2, § 3; Ridg'ey's body of Divinity; Reed's Apology; Dr. Wall; Fonda p. 97, 98.

hundred years after the birth of Christ. Then the German Anabaptists arose. These wild fanatics strenuously opposed infant baptism. For more than eleven hundred years, the whole voice of history decidedly teaches that infants ought to be and were baptized. This voice then is for a moment opposed by a mere whisper from a little sect that very soon died away. History, after this slight interruption, continues to speak on as before in favor of infant baptism, till it was again interrupted by the Anabaptists in Germany about the year 1538. Since that date the history of infant baptism is too well known to need a passing remark. None can carefully examine this unbroken chain of historical evidence from before the death of John the Apostle, till this day; and then hesitate for a moment to believe that the christian church has from the apostles down, uniformly practiced infant baptism.

CHAPTER II.

MODERN CHRISTIAN WRITERS ON INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *All Pedobaptist writers of any note teach the doctrine of infant baptism.* These are numerous. Many of them are learned and devoted to the cause of Christ. Among them are many whose self-denying exertions in building up the Redeemer's kingdom, ought, at least to silence the boasting of immersers in relation to cross-bearing. A few of these writers besides those already mentioned as being in favor of sprinkling as a mode of baptism(*a*) may here be noticed(*b*). Those named in the note exceed seventy in number. They are only a specimen of those who might be mentioned as the advocates of infant baptism. Indeed, if there is a single Pedobaptist writer who rejects infant baptism or who states that sprinkling is not a mode of baptism, immersers ought to mention his name. They ought to quote his own language. They ought to refer to the page in his

(a) See B. iii, P. ii, Ch. 2, § 4. *(b)* These are Usher, Wardlaw, Hall, Jer. Taylor, J. Brown, Ewing, Dick, Stillingfleet, Hammond, Pearson, Barrow, Tillotson, Prideaux, Pocock, South, Burnet, Whitby, Beveridge, Berkley, Butler, Lowth, Secker, Newton, Buchanan, Glass, Fleming, Halyburton, Boston, McLawrin, Longley, Jenkins, the Erskines, Austin, Robertson of Edinburgh, Watson, Lye, Poole, Hunt, Chester, Beza, Knight, Walker, Professor Campbell, Blair, Robison, Calvin, Luther, Baxter, Owen, Mead, Flavel, R. Franklin, Howe, Watts, Tate, Brady, S. Clark, Ridgeley, Evans, Calamy, Thompson, Van Vranken, Neal, Blake, Bells, Lowman, Morton, Lardner, Winter, Stafford, Jay, Romaine, S. S. Smith, Brownlee, Pressly, &c.

book where such statements are found. The very expression should then be pointed out. Till this is done, all their intimations, hints or assertions, that Pedobaptist writers favor their exclusive claims, must, with intelligent men, pass for—nothing. Pedobaptist writers constitute a "great cloud of witnesses" in favor of infant baptism. Hundreds, nay thousands of them are pious, talented, learned, biblical scholars. Their testimony therefore deserves as much confidence as it is proper to give to human authority. It might claim too, it would seem, as much confidence as the unsupported assertions of less than one fiftieth part of their number of men who, not unfrequently, exalt ignorance to the station of a religious teacher. If this matter was to be decided by the weight of human authority, and impartiality was to give the decision; it is at least possible that the opinion of a hundred men of learning and piety, would be worth as much as the bare assertion of one or two immersers whose superior knowledge and piety, to say the least, might well be questioned. Pedobaptist writers on this subject present an amount of evidence which no wise man will treat with supercilious disrespect. Few human beings will be found so opinionated, so self-conceited, as to answer with a sneer, such an array of piety and learning as is presented to the mind by those who have written in favor of infant baptism. All Pedobaptist writers of any note, and perhaps the whole of them of every description, uniformly maintain that the word of God teaches the doctrine of infant baptism. Their piety, their learning, their self-denying devotion to the cause of Christ, their numbers, place them on an eminence which sneers cannot reach. A sneer therefore when used as a substitute for evidence must fall, like a poisoned arrow, on the head of him by whom it is employed.

(2.) *Councils, Synods and Assemblies teach infant baptism.* Those which have been mentioned as holding that sprinkling is a mode of baptism(*a*), also hold and teach the doctrine of infant baptism. Besides these, every council, synod or assembly of any notoriety, which met in all the christian world before, and indeed long after the year 1538, taught, when they mentioned the subject, that infants ought to be baptized. Only a very few of these need be specially

(*a*) See B. iii, P. ii, Ch. 3, § 3.

named. Several ancient councils inculcate infant baptism. One of these met in Carthage in A. D. 253; another in 400; another in 401; and one of them met at Rome in A. D. 402. These and many other ancient councils teach infant baptism, and often mention it as the universal practice of the church(*a*). Moreover, besides these, the ecclesiastical assemblies of the different denominations in modern times, except a very few, all teach or take for granted the doctrine of infant baptism. The synod of Dort taught that "infants of believers"—"ought to be baptized"(*b*). The Westminster assembly assert that "the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized"(*c*). The general assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States (*d*), the general synod of the Reformed Dutch church (*e*), and the judicatories of the other Pedobaptist churches, teach by their minutes, that infants ought to be baptized(*f*). The Congregational churches may also be specially mentioned as holding to infant baptism. This they pointedly teach in their Platform(*g*). The minutes and public documents of these ecclesiastical assemblies, furnish a host of writers who stand as the representatives of thousands and millions of professing christians for whom they write. It is manifest from what has been said in this chapter, that multitudes of writers of the first order, both in their individual capacity and as representatives of ecclesiastical bodies, clearly inculcate the doctrine that to baptize infants is a duty required in the word of God.

CHAPTER III.

DENOMINATIONS ON INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *Almost all denominations of professing christians inculcate infant baptism.* This they do both by precept and example. In the world there are not less than 175 millions of persons who profess to believe in Christ. The Romanists, at least 80 millions in number, all in profession baptize infants. Not less than 30 millions of persons who are members of the Greek church, both by precept and example, inculcate what they call infant baptism. The authority of

(*a*) See Mosheim, Wall, Marsh, Milner, &c. (*b*) See Con. Fes. Art. 34. (*c*) See Shorter Cat. Quest. 95. (*d*) See Min. for 1812. (*e*) See Min. for 1804–1841–1816–1817. (*f*) See their Min. (*g*) See Ch. 12, § 7.

these is of little moment; as they do not, even in profession, take the word of God as their only rule in all religious duties. But of more than 65 millions of protestants, all except about two millions hold to infant baptism. About one million of professed protestants entirely reject baptism with water; and about the same number who are not Romanists or of the Greek church, and who profess to believe in this ordinance, reject infant baptism. The denominations which have been already mentioned as holding to sprinkling as a mode of baptism(*a*), all maintain that to baptize infants is a duty required in the scriptures of truth. Moreover, it ought to be remembered that a large portion of these protestants are christians who require their religious teachers to be thoroughly educated men; while immersers of every name, very frequently place ignorance in the pulpit to teach men "to observe all things" which Christ has "commanded" in the holy scriptures.*

2. *The christians of St. Thomas teach the doctrine of infant baptism.* They inhabit the southern part of Hindoostan. Some of them were found there as early as the year 189. They had Matthew's gospel in the Hebrew language. This they received, as they affirm, from Bartholomew one of the apostles.† In the fourth century a number of christians from Antioch in Syria, being driven from their own country by persecution, took up their abode in Hindoostan. These and the christians who had then with their predecessors, been inhabitants of the country for about two hundred years, soon became amalgamated. These became known to Europeans in the fifteenth century. Till then they had never heard of any professed christian who denied infant baptism. They themselves had always baptized infants. They trace their origin to Thomas the apostle(*b*). This denomination, not only teach infant baptism, but they also maintain that it originated in apostolic times.

3. *The Sabian christians of Syria teach infant baptism.* These call themselves disciples of John or Daily Baptists. They baptize their children when they are "forty days old." They say that John the Baptist, on ordinary occasions, stood "on dry ground" when he baptized. They do not baptize

(*a*)See B. iii, P. ii, Ch. 3, § 2. *Mat. 28: 20. †Mat. 10: 3. (*b*)See Eusebius; Buch. vol. 4, p. 215 Phil. Ed. 1815; Fonda p. 96. 97; Sket. of Sect. No 3.

in the name of the Trinity. Theirs is not therefore christian baptism.* They immerse three times. This three-fold immersion, they call one baptism(*a*). As they baptize children at the age of forty days, their authority is decidedly in favor of infant baptism. But their authority is of but little value as they are professedly the disciples of John the Baptist, and not of Christ.

4. *The principles of those who baptize none but adults prove that infants ought to be baptized.* They admit, as a principle, that those who are truly regenerated by the power of the holy Spirit, may be baptized. If those who are born again, converted, baptized with the Holy Ghost, sanctified and fit for heaven, may not be baptized; it is difficult, if not impossible to conceive who may receive that ordinance. But if the truly regenerated may be baptized, then infants may be baptized; because infants have been and may again be made the subjects of the renewing grace of God. They have been and may be "sanctified," and "filled with the Holy Ghost" in his regenerating influences from their earliest infancy.† Little children then must be baptized; for they, by the renewing power of the Spirit, have been prepared for heaven.‡ But since those who are the subjects of God's converting grace may be baptized, then infants may receive this ordinance; for in their souls, the Holy Spirit has produced, and may again produce the principles of the christian graces and affections. If all infants dying in infancy are new-created in Christ Jesus,§ then certainly infants ought to be baptized. They are guilty of no heresy in principle or in practice on account of which they can with propriety be excluded from that holy ordinance.

Uninspired men cannot tell what infants are regenerated, nor can they tell what adults are truly born of God. But if they may baptize adults without knowing certainly that they are the true children of God; they certainly may, on the same principle, baptize infants without knowing certainly that they are or have been the objects of the renewing grace of the Spirit. If an adult professes to be a christian when he is not, he is uttering a solemn falsehood. To be

*See Mat. 28: 19. 20, and B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 6. (*a*)See Taylor's Apostolical Baptism. †Jer. 1: 5, Luke 1. 15. ‡See 2 Sam. 12: 22. 23, 1 Kings 14: 1. 3. 12. 13, 2 Tim. 3: 15. §See Eph. 2: 10, 2 Cor. 5: 17.

guilty of such a heinous sin, even an immerser would scarcely say, was essentially necessary in him who would receive the ordinance of baptism. Few persons would be willing to say that to utter a positive untruth in the most solemn way was really necessary to the validity of baptism with water. But if to do so is not essential to baptism, then an infant who says nothing may be baptized while destitute of the renewing grace of God, as truly as an adult who professes to be born "of the Spirit" when he is not. The very principles therefore of those who baptize none but adults, prove that infants who are or may be born again, ought to be baptized no less than adults who are or may be born again. Such persons must therefore baptize infants or prove recreant to their own professed principles. They, to be consistent, must baptize infants, or deny that they are or may be regenerated, or deny that the truly regenerated may be baptized. If the regenerated may be baptized, and if infants are or may be regenerated, then infants may be baptized.

It may also be remarked that in former days when Pelagianism and Arminianism, under the names of Popery and Prelacy, threw their withering blight over most of christendom, and were drunk "with the blood of the saints;"* then nearly fifty millions of these "baby-sprinklers," as they are often contemptuonsly called, laid down their lives rather than relinquish any portion of their religion. More believers in infant baptism have suffered martyrdom, than would far outnumber all those who have ever practiced the immersion of adults only. The whole of these, as given in history, would by no means equal or come near doing so, the number of those "baby-sprinklers" whose souls have been forced by the cruel hand of persecution to quit their tabernacles of clay. The testimony of so many hundreds of millions of christians as have, in different ages of the church, taught and practiced infant baptism,—the testimony of so many millions of martyrs as have testified in favor of this same truth, is authority which cannot easily be resisted. No man of sense or piety will attempt to treat with contempt the principles and practices of such an assemblage of christians,—of such an army of martyrs(*a*).

*Rev. 17: 6. (*a*) It may be proper to remark here that Mr. W. Jones, an Englishman has written what he calls "The History of the Christian Church." A portion of

PART FIFTH.

IMPORTANT MATTERS CONNECTED WITH INFANT BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT INFANTS ARE TO BE BAPTIZED.

1. *Parents who are in covenant are bound to have its seal applied to their children.* God commands parents who are not in covenant to enter it and receive its seal. He also commands those who have received the seal of the covenant to apply it to their children(*a*). If the parent has been baptized, believes all the truths of God's word, manifests his love to these by obeying the Divine requirements in an orderly walk and a conversation becoming the gospel; then charity requires that he should be viewed as being in a truly con-

(*a*) See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1, par. 6.

his book might, with propriety, be called an anti-Pedobaptist misrepresentation of facts in relation to the mode and subjects of baptism. In America, immersers have altered the word of God to make it correspond, in some measure, to their system. In England, they, by their *historian*, have, for the same purpose, falsified church history. They have, on one side of the Atlantic, laid unholy hands upon the Bible and altered God's book. On the other side of it, they have perverted the records of God's people. But they cannot destroy the original scriptures. They cannot blot out of existence the sources of historical evidence. They cannot prevent men from examining these. They cannot hinder the truth from being told. To show that Mr. Jones as a historian is unworthy of credit, one fact must here suffice. He represents the Waldenses as being opposed to infant baptism. In professing to give Perrin's views on this subject, he says; "they observed the ordinance of baptism, according to the primitive church." But Mr. Perrin expressly states, that "they caused their children to be baptized, according to the primitive church." That the Waldenses,(except the Petrobrussians who were, while they existed, about the one fortieth part of the whole number) baptized infants, and maintained sprinkling to be a mode of baptism, is as undeniable as historical evidence can make any facts. (See J. P. Perrin's His. Wal. Fol. Ed. Lon. 1711, p. 27. Sir S. Morland, Leger, Wharey p. 314-320, Dr. J. M. Mason. Dr. S. Miller on baptism p. 29. 97, Dr. Brownlee, &c.) That Mr. Jones does not fairly present these historical facts is proved from his own statements; see p. 338 and other parts of his book (Albany Ed. 1824.) That cause must be rotten at the core, which, to sustain its exclusive claims, has to alter the scriptures and falsify ecclesiastical history. Men of truth must be permited to adopt a religious system which does not need such modes of defence.

It is sometimes insinuated that the Baptist denomination do not sustain the alterations made in the scriptures by some of their leading men. A minister belonging to that sect was the editor of the Baptist Bible. Other ministers of the same denomination advocate and circulate it. All these men who thus publish and circulate this altered Bible, are sustained in their ministerial office and character by the Baptists. Not one of those engaged in making or circulating this perverted Bible, has been publicly deposed from the ministry by them for the part he has taken in this high-handed invasion of God's word. Till this is done, the denomination, as a body, are, either directly or indirectly, sustaining this alteration of the scriptures. No insinuation to the contrary can alter the fact. The Baptist denomination must publicly censure those who have been openly guilty of altering God's word, or they as a body, are guilty of sustaining, either directly or indirectly, this attack made upon the revelation which he has made to man. To pretend that they have nothing more to do with it than other denominations, is an insult offered to the common sense of the public. Have they, indeed, nothing more to do with the public acts of their own ministers than other denominations have? Truly if they think so, they have very little acquaintance with the regulations of their own church.

verted state. He who has received the seal of the covenant, who believes and loves all the truths of God's word, and whose external deportment is fair, cannot, with propriety, be suspended from any privilege of the covenant which he may desire to enjoy. He might, upon such evidence of regeneration, be allowed to partake of the Lord's supper. But if he himself might be permitted to receive the holy communion, he certainly may be allowed to have the seal of God's covenant applied to his child. He cannot, while he thus, in principle and in practice, conforms to the word of God, be suspended from covenant privileges. But to refuse to baptize a person's child, is, in fact, to suspend him from the use of covenant or church privileges. By that very act, he is deprived of a privilege which those who have a standing in the covenant, have a right to enjoy. If he asks to have the seal of the covenant applied to his child before he asks to sit down at the Lord's table, he, if he might with propriety enjoy both privileges, ought not to be deprived of the one, merely because he asks it before he does the other. But if a person is immoral, rejects any one truth or more of God's word, slights or treats with disrespect any Divine ordinance or disregards any commanded duty ; he then, not only may, but ought to be suspended from the privileges of the church. While in that state, he ought not to be allowed to take his seat at theLord's table. He ought not then to be allowed to receive the seal of the covenant for his child. The child is in covenant, because the parent is. When therefore the parent is suspended from the covenant, either directly by a positive act of discipline, or indirectly, by refusing baptism to his child, he cannot, while in that state, receive its privileges either for himself or for his child. The child while in infancy, being incapable of asking the seal of the covenant for itself, neither asks for nor is refused any privilege. If therefore the parent is refused the privileges of the covenant, the child, from its infant state, cannot ask for itself this seal or any other privilege. To refuse to baptize the child of a parent is to suspend that parent from the privileges of the church. But parents who are in covenant are bound to discharge its duties. One of these is to have their children baptized.

2. *Some infants have a right to be baptized.* Some infants are in covenant with God. They were received into that relation by Divine authority.* Those infants therefore who are in covenant, have a right to its seal. This, in New Testament times, is baptism(*a*). God receives infant children, with their parents, into covenant with himself. When therefore one of the parents is in covenant with God; so also are the children. But if the parent with the children, is in covenant, they, unless the parent is deprived of this privilege, have a right to this ordinance. Whatever is a proper covenant seal for the parent to receive, is also a proper one for the child. When the parent has a right to the seal of the covenant, his child has also a right to this its confirming token. God himself has established this principle. He has definitely settled this matter. If the parent has a right to the seal of the covenant, so has the child. This is God's decision.* It must therefore be proper. It is then manifest that while the parent has a standing in the covenant, the child has a right to its seal; and as in New Testament times, the seal of the covenant is baptism(*a*), so now the children of baptized parents who retain their standing in the covenant, have a right to this holy ordinance.

3. *Any infant can be baptized.* Whatever is essential to a subject of baptism belongs to every infant(*b*). Any infant may therefore be baptized. It is as possible to baptize an infant child of any parent, as it would be to baptize the parent. It is as possible to baptize any infant as it was to baptize Simon the Samaritan sorcerer(*c*); because no infant can, in its own person, be more destitute than he was, of all spiritual qualifications for baptism. Every infant, as certainly as he did, possesses all that is essential to a proper subject of baptism. Every infant is a more suitable person to receive that holy seal of the covenant than he was; because no infant is or can be guilty of his crimes or be so hardened in wickedness as he was.† When a child is baptized, it receives the seal of God's covenant. Before it receives this seal, it must be either directly or indirectly, received into covenant. If its parents are in covenant, then it sustains a covenant relation by a direct and positive enact-

*See Gen. 17: 7. 9–14. *(a)* See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 11; P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1, par. 11. *(b)* See P. ii, Ch. 4, § 1–4. *(c)* See P. ii, Ch. 2, § 1. †See Acts 8: 9–13, 18–23.

ment of God. If its parents are not in covenant, then it is indirectly received into covenant by one of the ambassadors of Christ. This act, as well as the administration of the ordinance of baptism, is official. When the child of unbaptized parents is baptized, the responsibility of him who administers the ordinance, is fearfully great. Such parents are not in covenant with God. They themselves neglect to enter into covenant with him. They do not receive its seal. They thereby prove that they have no regard for God's ordinances. They will therefore take little or no interest in the spiritual welfare of their children. To bring infants into covenant, and under such circumstances, apply its seal to them, is fearful unfaithfulness on the part of him who administers the ordinance. Such an act on the part of a minister, shows that he has no true regard for God's authority. On the part of the parent, it shows that, while, by having his child baptized, he professes to be a christian, he is, nevertheless, entirely destitute of the power of godliness. By this act he takes hold of God's covenant, while he disregards a covenant God.

The infant who is baptized under these circumstances, is laid under covenant obligations to live for the glory of God. It is bound in covenant to obey all his commands. To learn its obligations and how to discharge them, it is not likely to have any opportunity. By the unfaithfulness of a faithless watchman, it is placed in a situation in which it is in great danger of living a covenant-breaking life. The curse of a covenant habitually broken, is likely to rest on such a child. The curse of God against the unfaithful shepherd* must rest upon him who dares to trifle in this manner with the seal of God's covenant. But as the sin of the administrator cannot cling to the baptized, so it cannot render the ordinance invalid. If water, the sealing material, not in too large quantities, is, by a man holding the office of a minister of the gospel in New Testament times, applied to an infant or to any other human being, in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, then the ordinance of christian baptism is administered. Then all that is absolutely essential to the existence of this ordinance has been performed. Then the ordinance of baptism must be valid.

*See Ezek. 34: 2-19.

The unfaithful use of the seal of God's covenant is a fearful evil. This is one reason among others, why baptized infidels and profligates throng our streets; why baptized enemies of God swarm in almost every neighborhood. To break God's covenant, graciously made with man, is a most heinous sin.* Those who are guilty of it, are generally found among the most profane of the infidel race. In order to progress in the ways of sin, they must break over the restraints of God's covenant as well as those of his law. It is often remarked that "baptized children are as bad as others." Sometimes there is truth in the remark. This is frequently the case when the seal of the covenant is perverted. Then this is a truth not to be denied. This evil may therefore in almost all, if not in every case, be traced to the unfaithful use of the seal of God's covenant. Such children have been baptized, but they have not been trained "up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."† Let him therefore who prostitutes this holy ordinance, this seal of God's covenant, tremble in view of a coming judgment. Let him now be aroused to a sense of his duty, if his conscience has not yet been "seared" as "with a hot iron."‡

4. *Persons baptized in infancy know the fact.* There are a number of ways by which a person may become acquainted with a fact. He may know the truth of a statement; (1.) By the evidence of his senses; (2.) By mathematical demonstration; (3.) By Divine revelation; (4.) By historical evidence; (5.) By experiment; (6.) By the testimony of records and of living witnesses. A reasonable amount of evidence presented to the mind from any one of these sources, convinces reasonable men. When convinced by evidence which is suitable in kind and sufficient in degree, they believe the position thus proved. They believe it, because they know it to be true by the knowledge which they have obtained from some proper source of evidence. Reasonable men believe what they know from good evidence. They do not believe that of which they have no knowledge; and they know that for which they have proper evidence.

Persons know that they have been baptized either from the evidence of their senses or from other testimony. Very few persons would have any knowledge of the baptism of

*See Jer. 11: 10, Rom. 1: 31. †Eph. 6: 4. ‡1 Tim. 4: 2.

others, if they could know nothing but that for which they had the evidence of their own senses. From this source of knowledge, no immerser could know whether one in fifty of his fellow immersers had or had not been immersed. How many of those immersed in the United States did any one person see go or put under the water? Perhaps no one individual has stood by while more than fifty were immersed. It is only by the testimony of others, that he knows and believes that the remainder were immersed. By the same kind of testimony persons baptized in infancy know the fact. They know that they, in infancy, have received the ordinance of christian baptism, (1.) From the testimony of their parents; (2.) From that of the minister who baptized them; (3.) From the senior members of the church; (4.) From the testimony of the church records. Those who know a fact from such testimony as this, know it just as certainly as they could know it from any other evidence. But be this as it may, they know the fact of their own baptism, from the very same kind of evidence, and know it as certainly, as any immerser knows that his fellow immersers have been entirely under water as a substitute for baptism. If knowledge arising from the testimony of others will do for immersers, they show more of the old Serpent's cunning than of true spiritual wisdom, when they endeavor to lead persons to doubt whether they were or were not baptized in infancy, by telling them that they do not know the fact, because they were infants when the ordinance was administered to them. But it ought to be remembered, that if the testimony of others is good evidence for immersers, it is also good for baptizers. If an immerser can know that a person has been immersed who was put under the water while he was at the distance of one hundred or five hundred miles, a baptizer can know, from the very same kind of evidence, that is, the testimony of others, that he was baptized in infancy. Persons who have been baptized in infancy may know the fact by a four-fold evidence. This is sufficient for those who believe that for which they have good proof. But those who, without any evidence, believe that immersion is the only mode of baptism, and without any authority exclude infants from the seal of God's covenant, would certainly feel

insulted if it was insinuated that they require evidence for that which they believe. But no such insinuation is here intended. Indeed, they believe their exclusive system, (if they really do believe it,) without the least shadow of evidence of any kind. It would be entirely wrong therefore to suppose that they require evidence in favor of what they believe, or rather of what they *profess* to believe.

CHAPTER II.

ADVANTAGES OF INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *To be in covenant with God is an advantage.* The infant descendants of Abram were in visible covenant with God. All the advantages of having a God in covenant was theirs. The promises of God's covenant was theirs.* Baptism is of as much advantage to the christian's child as circumcision was to the infant seed of a Jew. The promise of the covenant was made to the Jew and his seed. The same "promise" of the covenant is continued to the christian and to his "children"†(*a*). To be entitled to the promise of the covenant is a special advantage. To those who are interested in this covenant, its promise belongs. For infants therefore to be in the covenant and to be entitled to its promise must be a great advantage, unless circumstances render it otherwise.

To question the utility of a Divine ordinance, is truly impious. Baptism was instituted by Divine wisdom. It was by the same authority required to be administered to infants(*b*). For a worm of the dust to step forward and demand of his Maker, what advantage there is in obeying his command, is an unblushing insult offered to the King of kings.

2. *To be publicly recognized as in visible covenant with God, is an advantage.* When infants are baptized, they are, by that act, publicly recognized as sustaining a covenant relation to God and to his visible people. In baptism they receive the seal of the covenant. This is, in itself, a great blessing. But this like other blessings, if the baptized violate the covenant, will become a curse on the head of the transgressor. Those who are in covenant are in the way of

*See Gen. 17: 7. 8. †See Acts 2: 39. *(a)* See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1, par. 8. *(b)* See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 5. 7.

covenant blessings. Every christian knows the advantages of being in this way. Here he frequently meets and holds communion with his covenant God. Here, to the christian's children, he is often manifested as their covenant-keeping God.

The symbolical "locusts" were not allowed to hurt any that had "the seal of God in their foreheads."* To be thus preserved was certainly an advantage, but to secure this, the Divine protection, the seal must be "in the forehead." God has not told us that he will acknowledge that as a seal of his covenant which covers the whole body. God exercises a special care over his sealed ones. Infants need this special care. God chooses to exercise it over those who wear the seal of his covenant in their foreheads; therefore to have that seal in the proper place is a great blessing.

It is often asked with a sneer, "what good does it do to sprinkle a little water on an infant's face?" It might be asked in reply, "what good does it do to put an adult entirely under water?" So far as the mere act of putting an adult under water is considered, and the act of sprinkling water on an infant, the one is certainly as important as the other. Besides, sprinkling a little water on an infant's face does no harm. But immersing the body entirely under water often does(*a*). As far therefore as the two acts are concerned, sprinkling a little water on an infant's face will, in the estimation of sensible men, appear to be at least as useful as the immersion of an adult entirely under water. But when baptism is viewed as a seal of that covenant into which God has been pleased to enter with his visible church, when it is contemplated as a Divine ordinance, as a solemn religious duty; then sneering is out of place. Under such circumstances, with those who regard the authority of their Creator, preserver and final judge it will scarcely be allowed to pass with a silent rebuke. The baptism of infants is a solemn duty, or it is an act of solemn mockery. With the King of kings, a sneer will not answer as a substitute for a solemn duty. With men of sense, it will not answer as a substitute for evidence. It will only have a tendency to deceive the more ignorant part of those who know not the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who first substitute immersion for baptism and then

*Rev. 9: 3. 4. *(a)* See B. ii, P. iv. Ch. 3, § 4.

sneer at God's own ordinance, deserve the pity and prayers, if not the stern rebuke, of all God's people.

3. *The blessings of the covenant are numerous.* To those in covenant, these are promised. Those children who are in covenant are (1.) Entitled to covenant instruction. This is a special blessing. In this matter God appears in his majesty as the children's friend. His direction on this subject is this; "these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children."* (2.) They are entitled to covenant restraints. The very thought of being bound in covenant to conform to all the requirements of the Divine law, will restrain the waywardness of children and youth. The covenant instruction which they receive exercises a restraining influence over them. (3.) They may plead the promises of their covenant God. What a blessing this is! (4.) They often receive covenant grace. Every christian will at once perceive that these blessings are special privileges which belong only to those who are in covenant with God. They can easily perceive how important they are to children.

4. *The obligations of the covenant are a great advantage.* Those who are in covenant are under covenant obligations. God requires them to keep his covenant. By this language they are bound to conform to all the stipulations of the covenant. These all require what is right and proper. It is therefore the interest no less than the duty of all others as well as of children, to comply with the whole of them. Those in covenant are bound by a two-fold obligation to comply with all the Divine injunctions. They are bound both by the commands and by the covenant of their God, to perform all its stipulations or duties. To obey is both a privilege and a duty. The more firmly persons are bound to do right, the more likely they are to do so. To have the obligations of the covenant laid upon infant children and to teach them these obligations as soon as they are capable of reflection, are to them great and unspeakable advantages. They are thus prevented from falling into many sins. They are in this way restrained from travelling so rapidly in the broad road to destruction, as they otherwise might do. To break over a double restraint is not so easy as to break over a sin-

*Deut. 6: 6. 7.

gle one. But when persons do break over the greater obstruction which God in mercy thus lays in the downward road, they sometimes rush on with a more fearful rapidity, than those do who had been under less restraint.

5. *All baptized persons are bound in covenant to read, believe, love and practice what God in his word requires.* They are bound in covenant to take the scriptures of truth for their only rule of duty in all religious matters. Those among them who believe and practice as religion either more or less than what God in his word requires, are covenant-breakers. The covenant requires them to believe as religious doctrines just what the scriptures teach, and to conform to all the Divine commands as their only external religious duties. All persons are by the Divine law, bound to do all this. But the baptized are also under covenant obligations to discharge these duties. These covenant obligations are exceedingly valuable to all baptized persons. They are specially so to children ; because children need more restraint, more direction, more instruction than adults do.

6. *Parents are bound in covenant to pray for and instruct their baptized children.* All parents, because they are such, are commanded by the law of God to do all this for their children. They are thus bound to "train" them "up in the way" they "should go," to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."* These and similar directions require all parents, both by precept and example, to train up their children to believe, think, speak and act in all religious duties, in accordance with God's word. At the child's baptism, the parent publicly recognizes his solemn covenant obligations to do for it what he was before bound by the law to do. This is an advantage to the baptized child. It must be manifest to all that the parent who is willing publicly to acknowledge his obligation to discharge all the duties which he owes to his offspring, by recognizing his solemn covenant engagement to do so, is much more likely to train them up properly, than the parent who will not thus recognize his obligations. Besides this his covenant engagement is an additional bond which binds him to discharge his parental duties. The more firmly a person is bound to discharge a duty, the more probable it is that he will attend to it. As

*Prov. 22: 6, Eph. 6: 4.

the parent who dedicates his child to the service of the Triune God in baptism, solemnly recognizes his obligation to train it up for his service and glory; so, by performing this act, the child is more likely to be trained up for heaven than if the parent refuses or neglects to recognize this obligation. Therefore to have the parent bound in covenant to pray for and instruct his children in ways of holiness both by precept and example, cannot but be an advantage to them.

7. *Ministers and church officers are bound in covenant to promote the spiritual interest of baptized children.* That this is an advantage few will deny. They are bound by the law to promote the spiritual interest of children in general. But they are under special obligations to watch over and instruct those who are baptized. These are in a very important sense, the lambs of Christ's flock. Indeed, baptized children are his visible lambs; because they are in visible covenant with him. Concerning these, the great Shepherd gives a special charge to all his ministering servants. He says to each of them; "feed my lambs." It is their duty to "feed the" whole "flock;" but they ought to watch with special care over the lambs. They are all to be fed with spiritual "knowledge and understanding."* To do this they are bound by their covenant obligations. It is even included in the ministerial commission. The expression "all nations" certainly includes infants and baptized children.† Those whom "the good Shepherd" commissions to feed his flock, certainly will not reject the lambs, the young of "the sheep," from the fold.‡ Those who have any true regard for the sheep, will not turn the lambs out into the wilderness to become the prey of wild beasts. But they will watch over and feed them with care. The under-shepherd who really loves God's truth, will take pleasure in communicating it to the lambs of Christ. But if it dwells only on his lips, or if he rejects the whole or even a part of it; then the lambs will be in great danger of being neglected. To have the office-bearers in the church of Christ, bound in covenant to watch over and instruct a child in the knowledge of true religion, and in other ways to promote his eternal welfare, is

*John 21: 15. 1 Cor. 3: 2, 1 Pet. 5: 2, Acts 20: 28, Jer. 3: 15. †See Mat. 28: 19. 20. ‡John 10: 12. 14. 27.

an unspeakable advantage. To this privilege the child, at its baptism, becomes entitled.

8. *Each person in covenant owes special duties to every other.* Those who are all in covenant with God, are thus bound, as far as they have an opportunity in providence, to pray for, watch over, instruct, and guide each other. This is a great advantage to adults. It often prevents them from falling into sin. It not unfrequently restores the wanderer, strengthens the weak, confirms the wavering, encourages the desponding, and enlightens the ignorant. But if the watchful care of experienced christians is an advantage to adults, it is much more so to children. These meet with a thousand temptations to which adults are not exposed. Snares are laid for them on every hand. Of the wiles of Satan and the devices of wicked men, they have little or no knowledge. For little children thus exposed, to have all the professed people of God bound in covenant to pray for, watch over, instruct and guide them, during their childhood and youth, is a benefit, ineffably important. This is a special advantage to a child in its early years. Any parent about to close his eyes in death, would realize it to be a privilege inconceivably great, to have the whole visible church of God under covenant obligations to promote, as far as they could in providence, the temporal and especially the spiritual good of his child. Such a benefit is secured to every baptized infant. It is in its baptism publicly recognized as being in covenant with God and his visible people. All therefore who are in this covenant are thus bound to do all this for the baptized child. The infant needs and receives all this, no less than the adult who receives the holy ordinance of baptism. What reflecting man will ask with a sneer; "of what advantage is all this to an unconscious infant?" Every person can at once perceive that the more incapable an infant is of taking care of itself, the greater to it is the advantage of having others bound in covenant to extend over it a spiritual or guardian care. This guardian care, every adult church member is bound in covenant, so far as opportunity offers, to exercise over every baptized child. Of the advantage of this to young children, no person can form an adequate conception. The principal advantages of infant

baptism mentioned in this section, are of special importance in childhood and youth. It ought ever to be remembered that all adult church members are bound in covenant; (1.) To pray for baptized children; (2.) To watch over them; (3.) To guide them both by precept and example into paths of truth and holiness; (4.) To instruct them, especially in the doctrines and duties of religion, as they are contained in the word of God.

9. *The relation which baptized infants sustain to God, is a special blessing.* They are in covenant with him. Its seal has been placed upon them. Its promise is theirs. God himself gives them this. He said to Abram, I will "be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee;" and to christians, he by his servant, says; "The promise is unto you and to your children."* The relation of children begins in earliest infancy. Here he promises to "be a God unto" infants, to children who are in covenant with him. When he makes such a promise as this to infant children, it includes invaluable blessings. To baptized infants and to others who have received this ordinance, he is a God in covenant. To all these and especially to baptized infants, he often grants (1.) Covenant restraints; (2.) Covenant directions; (3.) Covenant associates; (4.) Covenant instruction; (5.) Covenant temporal blessings; (6.) Covenant afflictions; (7.) Covenant promises; (8.) Covenant threatenings; (9.) Covenant ordinances; (10.) Covenant grace. Indeed, whatever they receive on earth, comes from a covenant God. Whether he smiles or frowns, he is still their covenant God. To the baptized person, whether infant or adult, he sustains this covenant relation. The blessings connected with it are numerous and valuable. To an adult they are important, but to an infant many of them are much more so. This will be manifest to any person who will only learn the number and kind of blessings promised in the covenant of which baptism is a seal(*a*). He can at once perceive that these are all as important to infants as they are to adults, and some of them, such as the restraints, directions and associates of the covenant, much more so. The covenant relation then which baptized infants sustain to God, is a very special blessing to them.

*Gen. 17: 7. 8, Acts 2: 39. (*a*) § 3; See also Gen. 17: 1-14.

10. *Persons baptized in infancy are not deprived of any privilege.* Liberty is an invaluable blessing. It differs essentially from wickedness. To have the privilege of doing right is true liberty. To have the privilege of doing wrong is entirely opposed to liberty. To steal and lie and swear and violate the sabbath and the like, is not to enjoy liberty. To live in sin is to be a slave. The author of all true liberty has said; "whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin."* To be bound to do right cannot diminish, but must always increase every person's liberty. The more firmly a man is bound to obey all the Divine requirements, the greater are his privileges. Obedience to God's commands is the most refined enjoyment. This is genuine pleasure, true liberty. To enjoy this, obedience must be prompt and implicit. Those who neglect or refuse to obey, or who in any other way actually disobey his commands, are thereby deprived of this true liberty. When an infant is baptized, it is not deprived of the privilege of obeying any one command of God. But its obligation to obey is, by its baptism, actually increased. By receiving this ordinance therefore, its liberty becomes more extended as well as refined. To believe in infant baptism is a positive duty. For parents to have their infant children dedicated to God in this ordinance, is both a duty and a privilege. To do for a child what God requires, is not to take away its liberty or to deprive it of any privilege. But he who neglects to have his children baptized, abridges their liberty, and deprives them of all the advantages which baptized children enjoy. He deprives them of God's covenanted mercies. Nor are children who are baptized in infancy, deprived of the privilege of choosing for themselves when they become adults. They and all other persons are bound to choose what God requires. God requires infant baptism. On this account therefore they are bound to choose it. Those who enjoy true liberty on this subject, do choose to believe in infant baptism and to sustain the practice. Those who wish to oppose God's authority in this matter, are much mistaken if they suppose that such opposition constitutes true liberty. This is far from being liberty in any one of its essential parts. To dedicate a child to the service of God cannot deprive it of the privilege of

*John 8: 34.

serving him according to his word. To bring a child under covenant obligations to conform in principle and in practice to God's revealed will, does not, cannot deprive it of the right to serve the Lord in the beauty of holiness. When Abram circumcised Isaac on the eighth day after his birth, he did not thereby deprive him of the right to obey that Divine command which required every male Israelite to be circumcised in infancy.* Those who mistake the slavery of sin, the violation of the Divine law, for liberty; those who deem it a privilege to do what God forbids, or to neglect what he requires, and only those, can really suppose that their privileges are abridged by having their obligations to obey increased. If to be ignorant of Divine truth, or to neglect it, or to live without any covenant restraint, or to grow up and remain for years, perhaps for life, in the constant reception of uncovenanted mercies, could be considered as a privilege; then baptized children who are trained up to love, reverence and obey the Divine commands, are deprived of such privileges. But to be in such a state is not a privilege, is not liberty. It is real slavery. Those who are trained up from infancy with little or no knowledge of Divine truth, with no covenant restraints thrown around them, exposed to every temptation, and either directly or indirectly encouraged in all popular sins, are thus prepared to become the easy dupes of any impostor. Even those who substitute their own fancies for Divine revelation, and who have, with unholy hands, altered God's own word, might easily lead astray such ignorant and vicious and unrestrained characters. But for a child to be, from its earliest years, in covenant with God; for it to be bound by this covenant to love and serve him according to his word; for it to be under special obligations to read the scriptures and to conform to their every requirement, cannot possibly deprive it of the privilege of obeying the Divine commands. Those therefore who, in the holy ordinance of baptism, dedicate their infant children to the service of the Triune Jehovah, do not deprive them of any privilege. They do not thus take from them the right of choosing to serve God according to his word. When a child is baptized, the parent, among other things, publicly recognizes and acknowledges his obligation to teach

*See Gen. 17: 12.

it the doctrines and duties of true religion as these are presented in the word of God. This prepares it for choosing intelligently in adult age, to conform to the Divine will revealed in the holy scriptures. From what has been here stated, several points are manifest. (1.) It is evident that to be ignorant and vicious and unrestrained by the Divine law and covenant is not a privilege. (2.) It is clear that to conform to God's revealed will is the very soul of true liberty. (3.) It is evident that to believe and practice what God requires in his word is to enjoy liberty. (4.) To be trained up from infancy to know and obey the Divine will, is the only effectual way to be enabled to make, in adult age, an intelligent choice in religious matters. (5.) To believe and practice what is right prepares the mind of a person to choose that service which God in his word requires. (6.) To neglect duty or to live in sin is the most effectual way to prepare the mind for choosing unholy or sinful principles and practices. If these call themselves charity, liberality, brotherly love or religion, they will almost certainly be embraced by the ignorant and vicious. (7.) Deceivers who almost always advocate ignorance wish to have the instruction of children neglected, or maintain that they should be left free from the restraints of God's covenant, in order that they, by their delusive practices, may, with the more ease, entangle them in their snares. (8.) Those who baptize infant children and thereby lay them under covenant obligations to love and obey all the Divine requirements, do not deprive them, when they become adults, of the privilege of serving God according to his word. (9.) Those who neglect or refuse to baptize children, deprive them of all the advantages of infant baptism. (10.) To live in the habitual practice of neglecting or of opposing infant baptism, is very far from being liberty or a christian privilege. To do this is only another name for slavery.

From what has been stated in this chapter, it is evident that baptism is not in any respect less advantageous to an infant than it is to an adult. It is also evident that in some respects, it is even more important to infants than to others. To both it is the seal of the covenant. To both it secures not a few external covenant blessings. To both it signifies

the work of the holy Spirit on the soul. Of that work baptism with water is the symbol(*a*). To both it is a public recognition of their interest in the covenant made with God's visible people. Around both, it throws wholesome restraints. To neither is it regeneration or necessarily connected with the new-creating power of the Holy Ghost(*b*). When any person names an advantage which baptism is to an adult, he, if he understands the subject, will readily perceive that its advantages to an infant are equal or even greater. A few of the advantages of infant baptism have been mentioned. The full value of these can be learned when the light of eternity beams upon this subject. But even in this dark world of sin, the christian can perceive much of their importance. He will not therefore, merely to please ignorant or designing men, be easily induced to train up his children "aliens from the commonwealth of" God's spiritual "Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise." He will not, to gratify such characters, leave them without any hope of enjoying, in infancy, the blessings of this covenant, and "without" a covenant "God in" this "world"* of sin and sorrow. The true christian has too much regard for the spiritual interest of his children to leave them thus exposed to the wiles of the great adversary of souls.

CHAPTER III.

EVILS OF NEGLECTING INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *To baptize infants is a duty.* This duty is frequently and pointedly and positively taught in the word of God(*c*). When therefore infant baptism is neglected, a positive duty is neglected. God requires the seal of his covenant to be applied to infants. To neglect to do so, is therefore to neglect a duty to God. The parent owes this duty to his child. If he neglects it, he then neglects a duty which he ought to perform for his child. To do what God requires, is also a duty which the parent owes to himself. To neglect to obey those commands which require him to dedicate his child to God in baptism, is to neglect his duty to himself as well as to God and to his child. To neglect such a manifest duty

(*a*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 9. (*b*) See B. i, P. iv, Ch. 1, § 16. *Eph. 2: 12. (*c*) See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1-10, and P. iii, Ch. 3, § 1-6.

to himself, to his child and to God, is one great evil of which every parent is guilty who, from any cause, neglects to attend to the baptism of his infant children.

2. *To neglect infant baptism is a sin.* To neglect a duty is a sin. Parents who neglect the baptism of their children, are living in the habitual neglect of this duty. They continually violate all those precepts which, either directly or indirectly, require them to dedicate their infant children to God in baptism(*a*). The sin of this neglect is exceedingly complicated. Its name might be Legion. Such parents violate the command of God. They transgress or neglect his covenant. They leave their children to grow up in the continual reception of uncovenanted mercies. They neglect God's offered blessings. They leave their children exposed to all the temptations of Satan and to the allurements of the world. The restraints of God's covenant are not thrown around them for their protection. In all this sin and much more, every parent who neglects to have his children baptized, habitually lives. The guilt of neglecting this duty has no palliation, when God in his providence gives the parent an opportunity of having his child baptized.

If a parent does not believe it to be his duty to have his children baptized, this, his sin, will not thereby be diminished. It may be increased. Men's duties do not depend on what they do or on what they do not believe to be such. When God commands, it is every man's duty to obey. All are bound to believe that to be a duty which God requires; and to neglect one duty cannot be a good excuse for neglecting another. Men's unbelief cannot free them from their obligations to obey the Divine commands. It cannot become a substitute for the discharge of any duty. The word of God requires every parent to believe in and practice infant baptism. His unbelief cannot remove this, his obligation. It will not even have a tendency to lead him to engage in the discharge of this solemn, this interesting duty which he owes to God, to himself, to his children, and it may be added, to the church and to the world. If a man does not believe it to be his duty to pray for his children or instruct them, his unbelief will not make the commands "of God without effect."* The Divine command, not men's

(*a*) See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1–10, and P. iii, Ch. 3, § 1–6. *Rom. 3: 3.

belief or unbelief, is the rule of duty. When he commands, men ought to believe and obey. But to neglect or refuse to believe, will not excuse a single human being from his obligations to render obedience to every or any Divine command.

Parents, because of the relation which they sustain to their children, are bound to do for them all that they acknowledge to be their duty, when they dedicate them to God in baptism. They do not, at the baptism of a child, assume new obligations. They only acknowledge the old, and lay others under obligations to assist them, as far as providential circumstances will permit, to "train" him up "in the way he should go." The baptism of the child therefore becomes a privilege to the parent. It is therefore to him both a privilege and a positive duty. The baptismal obligations, in all their extent, rest on every parent. From these he cannot escape so long as he is a parent. If he would have the whole church bound in covenant to assist him with their prayers, counsel and sympathy, in these his labors of love; he by having his child baptized and in no other way, can enjoy this privilege.

3. *To neglect infant baptism is to turn aside from God's mercies.* In his mercy, in his rich, free and sovereign grace, he permits, he commands parents to have the seal of the covenant applied to their infant children. To neglect to do this is to neglect both the grace and the promise of the covenant into which God has entered with his visible people. It is to set at naught his condescending love which he manifested in receiving infant children with their parents into covenant with himself.

4. *To neglect infant baptism is to lose all its advantages.* These are many; and each of them inconceivably valuable(*a*). To neglect and thereby lose all the blessings of the covenant is an evil the extent of which cannot be determined by man on earth(*b*).

(*a*) See Ch. 2, § 1–10. (*b*) Persons ought to present their own children in baptism. By the parent's own children is meant his natural descendants or his adopted children. God in his word, does not authorize any other persons to stand as sponcers for children or to present them for baptism. What are now, and have long been called sponcers or god-fathers and god-mothers are not mentioned in the scriptures. They receive no countenance from the word of God. In the early ages of the christian church, these characters are not named. In the fifth and sixth centuries, they are mentioned in special cases. Nor did Popery venture to forbid parents to present their own children for

Merely to neglect infant baptism, when God, in his providence gives us an opportunity of attending to it, is a sin of no small magnitude. Every parent ought to reflect on this subject. He ought to ask himself, what account he is prepared to give to God for neglecting to apply the seal of the covenant to the infant children whom he is training for eternity. The obligation is constantly resting upon the parent to dedicate his child to God in baptism. He must perform the duty or live in habitual sin. Parent, which of these will you do?

CHAPTER IV.

EVILS OF REJECTING INFANT BAPTISM.

1. *Some men reject infant baptism.* This truth is generally known and acknowledged. Infant baptism is a positive duty required in the scriptures. It might therefore be expected that some persons would reject it. That to baptize infants is a scriptural duty has already been clearly shown(*a*). That men refuse to discharge this duty, is also certain. The general reason why they reject this duty is simply this. They do not love, they even hate it. The word of God is plain and positive on this subject. Human authority on it is overwhelming(*b*). It must therefore in general at least be hatred to this duty or to the word of God which requires it, or certainly a want of love for these, which leads men to reject infant baptism. If men really hate this duty, it might

(*a*) See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1–10 and P. iii, Ch. 3, § 1–6. (*b*) See P. iv, Ch. 1, § 1–4 and P. iv, Ch. 2, § 1. 2. and P. iv, Ch. 3, § 1–4.

baptism till the ninth century. Then, at the council of Mentz, this privilege was taken from parents and given to god-fathers and god-mothers. Thus the responsibility of training up baptized children for God, was taken from parents their natural sponcers and given to those who had neither the will nor the power to instruct them in the principles or duties of the christian religion. To substitute, for children at their baptism, other sponsers instead of the natural or foster parents, is a mere relic of Popery. It receives no countenance from the word of God or from the primitive church. Nor did the pious Waldenses adopt this unscriptural notion. See Augustine, Cyril, Fulgentius, Perrin, Morland, Tertullian, Dionysius, &c.

The rite of confirmation is not authorized by any declaration contained in the scriptures. The apostles did not practice this modern ceremony. They confirmed the disciples by "exhorting them to continue in the faith." They adopted nothing like the rite of confirmation as practiced in all Romish and some Protestant churches. This with other superstitious ceremonies, was introduced into the church in the latter part of the second century and in the beginning of the third. These superstitious additions to christian ordinances, were practiced in the following order; exorcism, confession, renunciation, anointing and confirmation. Baptism preceded anointing. See Dr. Miller, Tertullian, Owen, &c.

well be doubted, even if they did not habitually violate other Divine commands, whether they in truth love any part of God's word. He who hates to discharge any one of the duties plainly and positively required in the scriptures, may well doubt whether he truly loves any of them. Those who love God's word, love it all. Those therefore who reject infant baptism, if they do not reject the scriptures entirely, certainly neglect to take them for their only rule in the performance of all religious duties. This is an evil of a fearful magnitude.

Of those who reject infant baptism and yet profess to believe the scriptures to be a revelation from God; some entirely reject baptism with water, while others immerse adults only. These would all manifest much more consistency, if they did not profess to receive the word of God as infallibly true, or if they did not professedly take it for their only rule in all religious duties. But for persons to profess to take that holy book for their only rule of duty, and then to alter it so as to endeavor to make it teach at least a small part of what they believe, is not a mark of love for God's truth. To reject, as they do, some of the duties which Divine revelation positively teaches, and frequently, if not habitually, violate some of its positive commands, is in those who profess to be guided by its precepts, very inconsistent to the mind of the christian.

2. *Those who reject infant baptism reject God's covenant.* God entered into covenant with his visible church in the days of Abram(*a*). Into this, as one of the parties, God brought infants and adults. He has not, at any time, excluded either of these classes of persons from the covenant. They therefore both together constitute one party in this covenant. Those who reject that covenant, a portion of one of the parties in which, is made up of infants, reject God's covenant. The church which he organized embraces infants and adults. Those societies therefore which refuse membership to infants or which do not recognize them as members, are not branches of that church which God has organized. In this his church, infant membership *is recognized.* By refusing to recognize infant membership in their societies, they reject the covenant into which God has en-

(*a*) See P. i, Ch. 3, § 1. 2. 8.

tered with his professed people. This embraced their infant children. When they reject this covenant there is no other made with his visible people for them to embrace. The only one into which God has entered with his visible church, includes infants as a portion of one of the parties. He has organized no church embracing adults only. Those societies which embrace adults only, cannot therefore be portions of that church which includes infants. That which God organized certainly embraces infants. When men exclude from the covenant one or more of the parties in it, they reject the covenant itself. If a society of persons should reject all adults from membership, that could not be a branch of the visible church; because they would then reject those whom God had received. On the very same principle, those who reject infants, cannot be a portion of the visible church. Such persons divide a party in the covenant and then reject one portion of those whom God made collectively one of its parties. By doing this, they destroy the covenant, or in other words, they leave it with but one party. The other is not composed of adults alone, but of infants and adults together. These together, not separately, form one of the parties in the covenant. To divide this party and reject a portion of it, is to destroy the party; and to destroy a party in the covenant is to destroy the covenant. Those who reject or destroy God's covenant, practically disorganize, as far as they can do so, the visible church on earth. This is one great evil of refusing to infants the seal of the covenant, or of rejecting infant baptism.

3. *To reject infant baptism is to substitute the wisdom of man for that of God.* He, in his wisdom, received infants into covenant with himself. He required its seal to be applied to them. The Lord Jesus Christ directed his servants to baptize them. He received them into his church. Those who reject infant baptism say, by their actions if not in words, that infants ought not to be or cannot be received into covenant with God. They deny its seal to them. They refuse to baptize them. They do not allow them a standing in the visible covenant into which God has entered with his people. In *their* wisdom, they reject infants from the covenant. God, in *his* wisdom, receives them into it as a por-

tion of one of its parties. In *their* wisdom, they refuse to infants the seal of the covenant. God in *his*, commands it to be applied to them. Christian baptism is now this seal. Therefore those who refuse to infants this baptismal seal of the covenant substitute their own wisdom for that of God. This is nothing less than a direct insult offered to Divine wisdom. It is to prefer the wisdom of man to that of God. It is an evil of no small magnitude.

4. *To reject infant baptism entirely would leave the world without a visible church.* The church which God organized embraced infants at its formation. It does so yet; for he has not excluded them from the covenant or from its seal. If men exclude them from their societies and refuse to apply to them the seal of the covenant, they thereby reject God's church and God's covenant. In God's church and in *his* covenant, infants are *in*cluded. From *theirs* infants are *ex*cluded. Their church and covenant cannot therefore be the same as God's. But that which God organized is the visible church on earth. This included infants. The seal of his covenant was applied to them. To refuse infants the seal of the covenant is therefore to reject the visible church which God organized on earth. This, if practiced by all, would leave the world without a visible church. There could then be no people in external covenant relation with the King of Zion. Then there could be no visible church.

God can, when he pleases, establish a church and form covenant relations with men. But human beings are not by him, authorized to organize churches on their own models. They have no right to say with whom and where he shall make covenants. He has not given them power to do this. Men have no right to exclude from covenant relation with God what classes of persons they choose. When they act in these matters, they must be governed by Divine wisdom or be guilty of insulting the King of the universe. Those who reject God's covenant and church in rejecting infant baptism, have no right to make such substitutes for these as will suit themselves or others. God has not authorized them to do this. But to refuse to apply to the infant children of believing parents the baptismal seal of the covenant, is to cast them out of the visible church. Those who do so, re-

fuse to allow these little immortals that standing which God himself has given them in his visible kingdom on earth. They will not baptize them. They thus refuse them the New Testament seal of the covenant. If all professedly religious societies should do this, then none of them would recognize infant membership. Not one of them could therefore be composed of adults and infants. But these two classes of persons formerly composed and still compose, the visible kingdom or church of God on earth. If the whole of these societies rejected infants from membership in them, then not one of them could be a branch of that church concerning which it is said; "of such"—"infants"—or "little children"—"is the kingdom of God."* Infants constitute a portion of one of the parties in that covenant into which God has entered with his visible people. When these are excluded, then one of the parties in the covenant is nullified; then one of them ceases to exist as such. But to destroy a party in a covenant is to destroy the covenant itself; for no covenant can exist without the parties between whom the agreement is made. If therefore the whole human race should unite in excluding infants from the covenant by refusing to baptize them, then no visible covenant could exist into which persons might enter with God. The covenant which he made with his visible people includes infants. To reject these is to reject the covenant; because in this way one of the parties in it, is, as such, destroyed. To cast infants out of the covenant which God has made with his visible people is to leave it with but one party; or in other words, this is to destroy the covenant. But where there is no covenant, there can be no church. If therefore all mankind should reject infant baptism, the world would be left without a visible church. This is no small evil.

5. *The injury which those who reject infant baptism do to children is very great.* To exclude infants from baptism is to deprive them of all its advantages(*a*). Those who do so, refuse to train them up in the way they should go. They leave them exposed to all the temptations of Satan and to the manifold allurements of the world. They eject the lambs of the flock from the visible fold of Christ. They refuse to bring them to the great Shepherd in the holy ordinance of

*Luke 18: 15, 16. (*a*) See Ch. 2, § 1-10.

baptism; and those who would bring them they often hinder. They deny them covenant mercies. These are only a specimen of the various and complicated injuries which the rejecters of infant baptism are guilty of doing to children.

6. *Opposition to infant baptism is rebellion against God.* For men to oppose what God requires is open rebellion against him. God made a covenant with his visible people. Into this he received infants. For men then to exclude them from it, is rank rebellion against heaven. Those who do so invade God's holy covenant and exclude from it one of the classes of persons who were, by Divine authority, made a portion of one of its parties(*a*). Such persons profane God's "covenant."* They, by rejecting it, treat it as if it was unworthy their regard. In rejecting infants from the covenant and its seal, they invade the prerogatives of the Most High. They even attempt to undo what he has done. As far as they can do so, they reject infants whom God has received into covenant. Thus they would exalt themselves above the Sovereign of the universe. They affect to remodel his covenanted church, that *they* may make it better calculated to promote the cause of religion. By acting thus they incur the guilt of rejecting the covenant and of insulting the wisdom of God. To oppose infant baptism is therefore to engage in open rebellion against a covenant-making, a covenant-keeping God.

The preacher who refuses to baptize infants, or who opposes infant baptism, rejects that part of the ministerial commission which requires those who hold it to baptize "nations"—"all nations."† This is certain; because every nation,—"all nations" certainly include infants. He who will not baptize infants, refuses to baptize families, whole families if an infant or young child is found in them. He therefore refuses to do what the apostles often did. Preachers therefore who oppose the baptism of infants or who refuse to baptize them, are living in habitual rebellion against the very directions which the Lord Jesus Christ gives to his ambassadors in their ministerial commission.

It is no small sin to live in rebellion against God. But the evil of leading others to trifle with his mercy and to rebel against the gracious covenant into which he has entered

(*a*)See P. i, Ch. 3, § 8. *Mal. 2: 10. †Mat. 28: 19. 20.

with his church, his visible kingdom on earth, is a degree of wickedness which, in view of a coming judgment, ought to make the guilty tremble. This subject claims the careful, the deep, the solemn attention of those who oppose infant baptism. They ought to realize that in doing so, they are living in habitual rebellion against that God who, in mercy and love, received infants into covenant relation with himself. They ought to know that Zion's King has not excluded them from a right to its seal and that men have no right to do so. By Divine authority that seal is now baptism. He has commanded the seal of the covenant to be applied to them. This command he has not repealed. It cannot be repealed by man. The rebellion of those who attempt to do so, is all open before the infant's covenant God. Let him who attempts to eject infants from the covenant and who refuses to apply its seal to them, remember that the infant's God will be his final judge.

Such are a few of the evils of rejecting infant baptism. Eternity alone can completely reveal their magnitude. A load of guilt, like a mountain of lead, must rest upon the soul of him who ventures to trample thus on the gracious covenant of a merciful God. May his guilt be washed away by the blood of the infant's precious Redeemer who says, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

A GENERAL VIEW OF INFANT BAPTISM.

IN THE FORM OF A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A BAPTIZER AND AN IMMERSER.

IMMERSER. Mr. Baptizer, do you hold to believer's baptism?

BAPTIZER. Please to state what you mean by believer's baptism.

I. Why, to hold to believer's baptism, is to maintain that believers ought to be baptized.

B. Then I hold to believer's baptism; because I hold that all true believers ought to be baptized if they have not received that ordinance.

I. But that is not exactly what I meant to ask. My intention was to enquire whether you maintain that professed believers ought to be baptized.

B. If such persons have not been baptized, they certainly ought to be. Indeed, a credible profession of a person's faith is all the evidence that man can have in this life to prove that any individual is a true believer. Men cannot search the hearts of their fellow-creatures.

I. But all this does not come to the point at which I am aiming.

B. Well, then, have the goodness to explain yourself more fully.

I. I intended to ask whether you do or do not hold to infant baptism?

B. I certainly do. The scriptures are too full and explicit on that subject for any intelligent believer in them to reject infant baptism.

I. I believe the scriptures to be a special revelation from God, and yet I reject infant baptism.

B. Do you believe that men have a right to repeal any portion of God's law?

I. I do not. For men to attempt to repeal or nullify any Divine command, would be to reject the scriptures. Such persons cannot believe in the word of God.

B. God has received infants into covenant with himself. When he organized the visible church in the days of Abram, they formed a part of its members. God required the seal of the covenant to be applied to them. Have men a right to repeal that portion of the law of the covenant which requires its seal to be applied to infants?

I. They have not. To attempt to do so would be to usurp the Divine prerogatives. God only can repeal his own laws. He and no other being can change his covenant or alter its seal or exclude from it any portion of that party which is composed of human beings.

B. Has God ever excluded infants from his covenant, or from a right to its seal?

I. He has not. The scriptures do not so much as intimate any such thing. Though infants are frequently mentioned both in the Old and New Testaments, their exclusion from the covenant or from a right to its seal, is not, in any form of words, taught in a single passage.

B. Have men any right then to exclude them from God's covenant and from its seal?

I. No; they have not. To attempt to do so would be rebellion against the high authority of heaven.

B. Has circumcision, in New Testament times, ceased, by Divine authority, to be the seal of the covenant for both adults and infants?.

I. It has. It is no longer the seal of the covenant for any person old or young.

B. What is now the seal of the visible covenant into which God once entered with his professed people?

I. The seal of this covenant is now christian baptism, and it always has been so since the institution of that ordinance.

B. Did circumcision seal spiritual blessings to any of the circumcised?

I. It certainly did; for circumcision was "a seal of the righteousness of—faith;" and a part of the promise of this covenant was, "I will—be a God unto thee and to thy seed." This certainly includes spiritual blessings.

B. Infants, you say, have not been, by Divine authority, excluded from this covenant, and that, in New Testament times, its seal is baptism.

I. I do say so. The seal of the covenant is now baptism, and God has not deprived infants of its use.

B. Why then do you not have your children baptized, since infants now have a right to that seal of the covenant?

I. I don't believe in infant baptism.

B. Will your unbelief on this subject be a substitute for your duty?

I. No; I don't believe it will.

B. Why then do you refuse to have your children baptized?

I. The truth is, to be plain with you, I do not like the obligations publicly recognized by parents in the baptism of their infant children.

B. But these obligations all rest upon you as a parent. To neglect these duties will not diminish their magnitude or number.

I. I know that. Have you any other evidence in favor of infant baptism?

B. I have, much. In the word of God, the command to baptize infants is positive and frequently repeated. The di-

rection which Christ gives to his ministering servants, requires millions of infants to be dedicated to the Triune God in baptism. Indeed, every passage in the scriptures which mentions infants as living in New Testament times, describes them as being actually baptized, or as having a right to that ordinance. Multitudes of examples of infant baptism are also mentioned in the New Testament. Infants were baptized by John,—were baptized in the cloud and in the sea,—were baptized in families,—and they are frequently mentioned as baptized church members. These and similar statements abound in the word of God. They all teach infant baptism in language too plain to be misunderstood by any person who will read the scriptures with care.

I. The word of God is so very pointed on this subject that no true believer in its statements, who is untrammelled by prejudice, can withhold his full assent to the doctrine of infant baptism.

B. Why then are you unwilling to have your children baptized?

I. I don't see any use in baptizing infants.

B. Is that a good reason why you should neglect to obey the positive command of God?

I. No; it is not. But there is no harm in neglecting to have my children baptized.

B. Do you really believe that there is no harm in neglecting to obey the positive command of God?

I. No; I do not believe that either. To neglect to obey the command of God, must be a sin.

B. Do you believe that you sustain a covenant relation to God?

I. I do.

B. How was this relation formed?

I. God, in the days of Abram, entered into covenant with his professed people. This covenant continues in full force in New Testament times. I became one of God's professed people, and by making a profession of religion, I entered into covenant with him.

B. Did you leave your children behind, when, as you say, you entered into covenant with God?

I. I did. I left them because they were infants.

B. Then you yourself are not in covenant with God.

I. Why so? May I not have him for my covenant God and leave my infant children to his uncovenanted mercies?

B. You cannot. God makes no covenant with professing parents to the exclusion of their infant children. You cannot enter God's covenant and leave your children in an uncovenanted state. He has made no provisions for such a step. He has not authorized you to enter into covenant with him, and, at the same time, leave your children "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise." He has made no covenant with man in which adults only form a party. By excluding your children from the covenant, you turn away from it yourself. You cannot have an interest in the covenant made with God's visible people, if in it your infant children have no interest. His covenant was and is made with believers and their children.

I. I cannot see how baptism can do an unconscious infant any good.

B. What good does it do an adult to be baptized?

I. Why? why? why? indeed I never thought of that.

B. Let me tell you then that baptism does an infant as much good as it does an adult. When therefore you ascertain the amount of good it does an adult to be baptized, you will know what good it does to baptize an infant. But if you should still remain ignorant on this subject, if you should never know so much on it as to be able to determine what advantage it is to an infant to be baptized; your ignorance would not be a substitute for your duty, or prove that infants ought not to be baptized.

I. I know all that very well. It is also undeniably certain that the scriptures teach the doctrine of infant baptism.

B. If then you believe the scriptures to be a revelation from God, and the only rule of duty, you will have your children baptized.

I. Must a man do all that the scriptures require him to do under the dispensation during which he lives?

B. It is certainly his duty to do so; and if he does not at least habitually obey the external commands of God, he acts very inconsistently, if he professes to take the scrip-

tures for his only rule in all religious duties. He would show much more honesty and regard for veracity, if he even rejected the word of God as a Divinely inspired rule of action for man while on earth, than to profess and act as you do.

I. Well, I don't believe in those parts of the bible which teach infant baptism. I only believe in the inspiration of the New Testament That is enough for a christian.

B. A true christian believes in the inspiration of the Old Testament as well as in that of the New. But the New Testament teaches the doctrine of infant baptism as pointedly as the Old does; perhaps more so. It also teaches that the Old Testament is inspired. Those therefore who reject the inspiration of the Old Testament cannot believe that the New teaches truth, much less that it is Divinely inspired.

I. But I can so explain every passage in the New Testament as to make it consistent with the rejection of infant baptism.

B. That would prove that you are able to pervert the word of God. But such a course would not prove that infant baptism is not taught in the scriptures. Besides, you would then have your own explanations or perversions of scripture for your guide, instead of God's own truth.

I. Do you suppose ——?

B. It is no matter what *I* or *you* or *any other person* may *suppose*. We have nothing to do with suppositions. The word of God is the only rule for christians in all religious duties. This has nothing to do with men's suppositions. It contains God's directions. It requires infants to be baptized.

I. Well, if the scriptures, in a thousand passages, taught infant baptism, I would not believe it to be true.

B. It is manifest then that you have no real love for God's word. It is also quite evident that you have no more respect for it than for any human production. Your belief in Divine revelation, if it can be called belief, has no heart in it. You follow your own fancies or those of other men, and then pervert the word of God in order to obtain its apparent countenance for your wild notions. As you value your eternal interest, I entreat you to seek the pardoning

mercy of God for your sin in neglectiug to have your children baptized. The Lord is yet waiting to be gracious. Do not any longer, I beseech you, trifle with his long-suffering patience.

I. You may say what you please. But I won't have my children baptized. If God does teach it in his word, I would rather not attend to it and that is reason enough for me.

B. I must now leave you. I pray the Lord to give you grace in the heart which may lead you to obey his holy commands in your life. These you profess to take for your only rule of duty. But yours is manifestly mere profession. You cannot now even plead ignorance on this subject. God's word is too plain to allow any palliation for your sin on that account. Ecclesiastical history, during the days of the apostles, and from that time till the present moment, shows that the church of God has always baptized infants. Whoever therefore is ignorant on this subject, must be wilfully so. May the Lord give you grace to enable you to attend to the important, the interesting duty of infant baptism.

I. But stop a moment. Infants do not know what is done for them when they are baptized.

B. God knew this when he received them into covenant with himself,—when he directed its seal to be applied to them,—when he commanded his servants to baptize them. When infants were circumcised, they had no knowledge of the nature of that "seal of the righteousness of—faith." But this their want of knowledge, did not prevent that seal from confirming to them the promise of the covenant. Nor can the ignorance of infants in New Testament times, render their baptism more or less valid. It is not the knowledge or ignorance of the infant subject of baptism, which entitles him to that ordinance. Nothing can do this but Divine authority. When this authority requires infants to be baptized, then they not only may, but must be baptized. If they are not dedicated to God in this ordinance, then those who neglect to have it administered to them refuse to comply with the Divine commands on this subject. Such persons continue to live in habitual rebellion against God. Besides, the ignorance of your children will not be a good substitute for your duty. God commands you and all other parents to

believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. He requires you also to dedicate your infant children to Father, Son and Holy Ghost. It is your duty to obey this and every other command of God. For you to say to him in relation to this Divine command; 'Lord my children are ignorant, they do not know what is done for those who are baptized,' would not be prompt and filial obedience. This would, in fact, be an attempt to teach Omniscience. It would be saying in effect; 'Lord, thou dost command me to dedicate my infant children to thee in baptism, but they do not understand the nature of that holy ordinance, therefore I will not obey thee in this requirement. In my judgment thou art wrong in this matter. I will, for the sake of promoting thy glory, neglect to obey, nay, I will oppose this thy positive command.' Such is the language of your actions. God, when he commanded infants to receive the seal of the covenant—to be baptieed—knew certainly what was and would be the amount of their knowledge. And with this his perfect prescience on this subject, he directed them to be baptized. This *you* would not have done, would you?

I. Indeed I would not. In that you are right.

B. You therefore differ from God. I prefer his wisdom to yours. May the Lord enlighten your understanding to perceive his mercy and grace in requiring parents to dedicate their infant children to God in baptism. My labors with you are now ended. The blessing of God and that only, can render them useful to your soul. Adieu. Remember, the Divine command requires you to dedicate your children to God in baptism.

STANZAS ON BAPTISM.

For immersion, in the Scriptures,
Not a word of proof is found(*a*);
But a nation, it is certain,
Were baptized upon dry ground(*b*).

God informs us, that to sprinkle,
Is a mode to be baptized(*c*);
In no other does he teach us,
That his grace is symbolized(*d*).

(*a*)See B. ii, P. i. (*b*)See B. iii, P. i, Ch. 2, § 5. (*c*)See B. iii. (*d*)B. iii, P. i, Ch. 1, § 6.

Infants of believing parents,
Are in covenant with the Lord(*a*);
To its seal they're hence entitled
In accordance with his word(*b*).

Infants by Divine direction,
Must with water be baptized;
Christ commands it as a duty,
Not by men to be despised(*c*).

His command is plain and pointed:
To obey the gracious voice
Of the infant's loving Saviour,
Is a duty, not mere choice.

All should listen to his teaching,
As recorded in his word;
Then would infants be by sprinkling,
Dedicated to the Lord(*d*).

Reader, when an immerser attacks you on his favorite topic, just ask him, (1.) To prove by some one passage of scripture that immersion is a mode of baptism; (2.) request him to point to at least one verse in any portion of Divine revelation, which will prove, either by precept or example, that immersion is the only mode of baptism; (3.) let him know that God once received infants into an "everlasting covenant" with himself, and required its "token," the "seal of the righteousness of faith,"* to be applied to them; (4.) ask him to prove, from any part of God's word, that they have ever been, by Divine authority, excluded from this "everlasting covenant," or from the use of its seal; and (5.) ask him to show from scripture that this covenant has ever been disannulled. By doing this, you will easily perceive that immersers have nothing but assertions and questions upon which to erect their whole windy superstructure.

(*a*) See P. ii, Ch. 4, § 4. (*b*) P. iii, Ch. 2, § 1. (*c*) See P. iii, Ch. 2, § 5. (*d*) See B. iii; B. iv, P. iii. *Gen. 17: 7. 9. 10. 11. 13. 14. 19, Rom. 4: 11.

CONCLUSION.

This work is now brought to a close. In it the reader's attention has been directed to the important subject of baptism in all its various parts. It aims at directing the mind to the holy scriptures as the only rule in all religious duties. It notices baptism with water; baptism unto Moses; divers baptisms; John's baptism; the baptism administered to Christ and that which he and his disciples administered before his resurrection. Moreover it treats of christian baptism and of baptism for the dead. This work directs the mind to baptism without water, and to that administered without Divine authority. It mentions the modes of baptism. It also states the exact point to be examined when the mode of baptism is to be discussed. It shows that there is no evidence in the word of God in favor of immersion as being the only mode or even as being a mode of baptism. It teaches that immersion as the only mode of baptism is improbable,—is impossible. It mentions the fact that no Lexicons, no Dictionaries, no Greek writers of any description, teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism. It also shows that all these use (βαπτιζω) the Greek word for baptize in a great variety of senses. It teaches that the Greek church does not hold that immersion is the only mode of baptism. It mentions the reasons which usually induce persons to be immersed,—also the origin and evils of immersion. Moreover, that sprinkling is a mode of baptism taught by the sacred writers and by primitive christians, is shown from the language which they use and from other evidence. This work also shows that true believers,—professed believers,—females,—and infants are proper subjects of baptism. It directs the mind to a number of commands requiring adults and infants to be baptized, and mentions many examples of the baptism of all these classes of persons; but it takes special notice of the examples of infants baptized. It shows that the whole force of the Greek language is used by the holy Spirit to prove infant baptism. It also directs the mind to the fact that every passage of scripture which mentions infants as living in New Testament times, inculcates infant baptism in some form of words. Besides, it notices the fact that infant baptism has been practiced by the church of Christ during, and

ever since the days of the apostles. In addition to this, it mentions what infants ought to be, and what may be baptized. It also teaches the advantages of infant baptism,—and the evils of neglecting or rejecting that holy ordinance.

From all this, it appears perfectly manifest that the sacred writers, the primitive christians,—and millions of the wise and good in every age since the death of Christ, have believed in, taught and practiced the baptism of infants by sprinkling. This we know, because they themselves tell us so. They do this in almost every form of expression. They very frequently, in the languages used by them, clearly and definitely express the application of this seal of the covenant to infants in this mode. Such evidence no candid enquirer after truth, can examine and resist.

May the Lord make his own truth on this subject and on every other, "quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword."* Then it will carry entire conviction to the understanding,—to the heart,—to the conscience of the reader. But without the special operations of the holy Spirit, the labor of writing and that of reading this book, will be in vain. May the God of all consolation therefore grant his special grace in rich abundance to the writer and to the reader for the great Redeemer's sake. Amen.

*Heb. 4: 12.

INDEX.

	Section.	Page.
Aaron and the other Levites sprinkled	1	208
Abrahamic covenant,	1	276
Adult baptism, not opposed to that of infants,	6	304
Advantages of infant baptism,	1–10	347
Allusion, none to immersion in scripture,	1–5	98
Anabaptists,	3	180
Apocrypha on immersion,	1	148
on sprinkling,	1	216
Apostles, their baptism confined to the Jews,	4	41
theirs not christian baptism,	7	42
were baptized with the spirit,	5	68
Authority, human, not the rule of duty,	1	215
Baptism, administered to Christ,	4	32
christian, administered, in what name,	6	50
to Gentiles and Jews,	7	50
who may administer,	5	48
is a significant ordinance,	9	51
is to continue to the end of time,	8	51
denotes the work of the spirit,	9	52
is a sacrament,	10	53
is a seal,	11	54
is not regeneration,	16	58
Jesus Christ did not receive,	4	32
is not to be repeated,	17	60
N. Testam't circumcision (par. 12,)	1	281
of families mentioned,	6	290
of infants commanded,	5	287
taught by our Saviour,	2	270
divine authority for,	1–7	269
examples of,	1–6	316
stanzas on,		373
administered to 3000 in one day,	7	127
which is a seal, not immersion,	10	129

	Section.	Page.
Baptism with the Holy Ghost, not immersion,	11	130
with fire, not immersion,	12	131
with suffering, not immersion,	13	131
without divine authority,	1–3	72
self, of the Jews,	1	72
of proselytes,	3	73
by females,	2	75
by laymen,	1	74
modes of	1–4	76
proper subjects of,	1–3	253
what necessary in a subject of,	4	257
what not necessary in a subject of,	1–3	253
true believers may receive,	1	259
professed believers may receive,	4	261
the spiritually baptized may receive,	2	260
the penitent may receive,	3	261
females may receive,	5	262
infants may receive,	1–6	264
can receive what is signified by,	3	265
of infants taught by John,	4	271
Paul,	3	270
the prophets,	6	273
of infants in the Red Sea,	5	272
christian, mentioned in scripture,	1	109
the sign of, and what is signified in,	6	202
with water, in every passage where mentioned, proves sprinkling to be a mode of,	13	207
by sprinkling, commanded,	12	206
can become universal,	9	204
christian, what is signified by, is sprinkled,	6	201
by sprinkling is a seal,	8	203
sprinkling the only mode of, expressly mentioned in scripture,	3	195
of Christ was by sprinkling,	1	207
of the Eunuch by sprinkling,	2	209
of Paul by sprinkling,	3	210
John administered his, by sprinkling,	4	210
of the Israelites was by sprinkling,	5	211
every example of, teaches sprinkling to be a mode,	6	213

	Section.	Page.
Baptism, the scriptural mode of, by sprinkling,	7	214
if but one mode of, that is sprinkling,	8	214
human authority for, by sprinkling,	1–4	215
Lexicons inculcate sprinkling as a mode of,	2–4	215
by sprinkling taught in the Apocrypha,	1	216
buried with Christ by, into death,	3	100
with fire,	1–4	69
with the Holy Ghost,	1	66
the work of Christ,	3	68
with sufferings, taught,	1	70
Christ received,	2	71
James and John received,	3	71
martyrs received,	4	71
all true christians receive,	5	71
with water taught,	1	9
is to continue,	1–4	10
for the dead,	3	64
John's, from heaven,	4	20
intended for the Jews,	9	22
peculiar to himself,	10	22
not administered in the name of the Trinity,	11	23
not the seal of the covenant,	13	24
not christian baptism,	18	29
Christ's, not for an example,	9, 10	36
Baptisms, divers,	1	14
Baptist, John the, lived in O. T. times,	2	17
his authority was divine,	4	19
commissioned by the Father,	5	20
had no successors,	6	20
his commission special,	8	21
intended for the Jews only,	9	22
his baptism peculiar to himself,	10	22
did not baptize in the name of the Trinity,	11	23
his disciples re-baptized,	12	23
his baptism not a covenant seal,	13	24
not a New Testament minister,	17	28
his not christian baptism,	18	29
Baptize, meaning of, not immerse,	8	94

	Section.	Page.
Baptize, immerse not its scriptural meaning,	7, 8	85
its true meaning in scripture,	2	192
the meaning of (βαπτω) its root,	4	198
its signification in the Septuagint,	5	200
its signification in Greek Lexicons,	1	141
in Latin Dictionaries,	2	144
in French and German Dictionaries,	3	144
in Dutch and other Gothic languages,	4	144
in English Dictionaries,	5	145
its meaning in Greek writers,	4	151
in Homer, (*note b*,)	2	150
history of the word, (*note c*,)	2	194
Baptized, Christ was, as a priest,	6	33
not as a substitute,	8	36
not to set an example,	9	36
any infant can be,	3	343
some infants have a right to be,	1	343
believe and be,	1	259
Βαπτισμοις (Old Testament washings)	1	14
this word signifies sprinkle,	3	195
Βαπτιζω, its meaning in scripture,	2	192
does not in scripture denote immerse,	8	85
cannot signify immerse,	5–16	125
in scripture it signifies sprinkle,	2	192
its meanings in Lexicons,	1	141
in the Septuagint,	3–5	195
in Greek writers,	1–4	148
in the Apocrypha,	1	216
as given by immersers,	4	155
Βαπτω, signifies to sprinkle,	4, 5	198
its meaning in the Septuagint,	7	146
in Greek Lexicons,	1	143
in Greek writers,	4	151
Battle of the frogs and mice (*note b*,)	2	150
Believers, true, to be baptized,	1	259
professed, to be baptized,	4	261
Βρεφος, βρεφυλλιον,	7	307
Buried, with Christ by baptism,	3	100
into death,	8	129
Bury, does not allude to immerse,	2	99

	Section.	Page.
Ceremonial washings, mode of performing,	7	202
Church, visible, attempts to organize a, with true believers only, absurd,	13	245
is God's visible kingdom on earth,	9	243
Church, visible, its members,	8	238
infants always members of,	8	239
its members in the Abrahamic covenant,	18	251
its privileges extended in N. T. times,	19	251
its members to be baptized,	1	269
in covenant with God,	3	269
organized in the days of Abram,	2	269
its covenant confirmed,	4	236
is one,	5	236
its members have a right to the seal of the covenant whatever that is,	6	237
Church, invisible, its members are adults and infants,	4	231
Christ's, not christian baptism,	4	32
Christ, by baptism consecrated to the priestly office,	6	33
baptized, not as a substitute,	8	36
not as an example,	9	36
his example, what it is,	10	36
baptized, why he was,	9	36
not immersed,	6	34
was sprinkled,	1	207
Christians, baptized with sufferings,	5	71
Chrysostom, on baptism, (paragraph 13,)	1	328
Circumcision, the O. T. seal of the covenant,	10	244
confirmed spiritual blessings, (paragraphs 4, 7,)	1	277
New Testament, (paragraph 12,)	1	281
Circumcised, all the, did not enter Canaan,	10	314
Claims of the exclusives,	4	163
Clean water, to be sprinkled,	1	189
Commentators, Pedobaptist,	4	219
Commission to baptize from Christ,	5	287
Confirmation, rite of (*note b*,)	4	360
Convert to Judaism and christianity contrasted,	10	316
Councils on baptism,	3	224
Covenant, all the baptized bound in,	8	352
blessings, of the,	3–9	349

	Section.	Page.
Covenant, parents bound in,	6	350
promises of the,	3, 9	349
Covered, to be, with any material, is not to be immersed,	6	108
Cross, immersion not a christian,	5	164
Cyprian on baptism, (paragraph 9,)	1	327
Daupian,	4	145
Death by immersion,	4	184
Denominations reject immersion,	2	154
adopt sprinkling,	2	222
Dialogue on immersion,		186
on infant baptism,		366
on sprinkling,		226
Dictionaries on baptism,	2–5	144
English,	5	145
on sprinkling,	4	216
French and German,	3	144
Dutch,	4	144
Difference between O. and N. Testament church, (paragraph 15,)	1	284
Dip, Greek word (δυπτω) for, not used for baptize,	2	149
Divers baptisms,	2	14
Divisions, who guilty of the sin of,	16	248
Dobe, the Danish word for baptize,	4	145
Doctrine of baptisms,	1	62
Dopa, the Swedish word for baptize,	4	145
Doopen, the Dutch word for baptize,	4	144
Drowned, Christ was not, (paragraph 8,)	3	104
Dry land, immersion on, impossible,	4	123
Israelites, baptized on,	4	124
Dutch, Danish, Saxon, Swedish, Meso-Gothic, the words for baptize in the,	4	144
Εμβαπτιζω or εμβαπτω not used for baptize,	6, 7	83
they denote immerse,	3	86
see also pp.	175–177	
Enon, described, (paragraph 2,)	1	113
why John baptized in,	2	139
Engravings do not teach immersion,	2	161
do teach sprinkling,	5	221

	Section.	Page.
Errorists most adopt immersion, (paragraph 4,)	6	119
Evidence for the claims of immersion, no,	4, 5	170
scriptural, for infant baptism,	2–7	270
from modern writers on infant baptism,	10	276
from divine command for infant baptism,	5	287
from human authority,	1–4	324
from examples of infant baptism,	1–6	316
from the whole force of the Greek language,	7	307
for infant baptism summed up,	7	308
Evils of neglecting infant baptism,	1–4	357
rejecting infant baptism,	1–6	360
of immersion,	1–4	182
Eunuch, not immersed, (paragraph 5,)	1	114
was baptized by sprinkling,	2	209
Examples of infants baptized in the cloud and in the sea,	1	316
by John,	2	317
by the command of Christ,	3	318
in families,	4	319
mentioned by Paul,	5	319
mentioned by John,	5	320
summed up,	6	322
Facts show immersion to be improbable,	6	118
Faith, true, not indispensable to water baptism,	1	256
Families, baptized,	6	290
the word (οικος) for house or family includes infant children,	6	293
Females, to be baptized,	5	262
Font, baptismal, (*note b*,)	2	144
the marble, at Syracuse,	3	162
Funeral, ancient, denoted by (θαπτω) the word for bury,	2	99
German Dictionaries on baptism,	3	144
Gothic languages on baptize,	4	144
Greek church on immersion,	1	154
writers on baptism,	2–4	149
Greeks, their use of (οικος) the word for house,	6	297
Gregory Nazianzen on infant baptism, (paragraph 11,)	1	328

	Section.	Page.
Hebrew Lexicons on (טבל) the word for (βαπτω) the root from which (βαπτιζω) that for baptize is derived,	7	146
Hindoostan, christians of St. Thomas, in,	2	338
History of the word baptize, (*note c*,)	2	194
ancient ecclesiastical, on infant baptism,	1	325
Homer on (βαπτιζω) baptize, (*note b*,)	2	150
House, (οικος) denoting family, signifies infants,	6	293
Households baptized,	6	290
Ignorance, evils of, in religious teachers,	10	97
Ignorant preachers, immersers often are, (paragraph 3,)	6	119
Immerse, the word baptize does not mean,	8	94
see also,	7–8	85
Immersed, who were in Noah's time, (paragraph 6,)	4	106
saved from being,	4	106
Immersers avoid giving proof for immersion,	4	173
mistake assertion for proof,	1	173
the point to be proved,	1–4	173
have altered the bible, (*note a*, No. 7,)	9	96
Immersion, evils of, as the only mode of baptism,	1–4	182
as baptism, when first taught,	1–7	178
as the only mode of baptism, when first taught,	3	179
in the Greek church,	2	179
not required in scripture,	1–4	82
this word not used in the English bible,	5	83
not used in the original for baptize,	3	86
no covenant for, in the original,	6	83
no example of, in the original,	3	86
no command for, or example of, in the English bible,	6	83
not a scriptural meaning of baptize,	7, 8	85
cannot be inferred from (απο) *from*,	7	93
from (εις) *into*,	4	90
from (εκ) *out of*,	5	91
from (εν) *in* or *with*,	6	92
from *into*,	2	88
from *out of*,	3	89
from the word baptize,	8	94

	Section.	Page.
Immersion cannot be inferred from transferring the word baptize into English,	9	95
learning, cannot infer, from the scriptures,	10	97
transferred from the Latin, (*note a*,)	9	96
the act of, eight-fold,	4	78
the point to be proved,	3	81
has two parts,	4	81
resembles no mode of burying, (par. 4,)	3	101
does not resemble the death, burial, resurrection or departure of Christ from the tomb,	6	166
cannot be a sign of what baptism denotes,	6	165
not the only mode of baptism,	1–6	109
not taught in scripture,	3	110
if but one mode of baptism, cannot be,	5	111
as the only mode of baptism, not probable,	1–8	113
not possible,	1–16	121
may destroy life,	1	121
while a person is standing, impossible,	2	122
cannot take place by applying water to the person immersed,	3	123
on dry ground, impossible,	4	123
in small vessels, impossible,	5	125
of 5,000 each day for 500 days, impossible,	6	126
of 3,000 by 12 men in 5 hours, impossible,	7	127
into death on the cross, impossible,	8	129
cannot prefigure Noah's preservation,	9	129
be a seal,	10	129
be baptism with the Holy Ghost,	11	130
with fire,	12	131
with sufferings,	13	131
is indecent,	14	132
unfits the mind for devotion,	15	132
cannot be the O. T. mode of washing,	16	133
cannot be a sign of the work of the Spirit,	6	165
symbolize the death of Christ,	6	166
persons not wet in,	7	159
semi-self, is that of most immersers,	6	158
no evidence for, as the only mode of baptism,	1-5	109
did not originate with the apostles,	1	175
with John the Baptist,	2	175

	Section.	Page.
Immersion did not originate with the Jews,	3	176
with Christ,	4	176
before the apostles,	5	176
with the Greek Fathers,	6	177
as a mode of baptism, originated in the dark ages,	1	178
in the Greek church,	2	179
as the only mode of baptism originated among the Anabaptists,	3	179
originated in America with Mr. Hollyman,	4	181
Infant baptism indirectly taught in scripture,	10	310
intimated in scripture,	8	309
a commanded duty,	5	287
taught by our Saviour,	2	270
by Paul,	3	270
by John,	4	271
by prophets,	6	273
by every passage which mentions infants in New Testament times,	7	273
by the whole force of the Gr. language,	7	307
by the Abrahamic covenant,	1	276
by the covenant of grace,	2	285
by families being baptized,	6	290
some of the evidence for, summed up,	7	308
examples of, in the cloud and in the sea,	1	316
by John the Baptist,	2	317
in families,	4	319
other examples of,	3, 5	318
summed up,	6	322
human authority for,	1–4	324
early christians in favor of,	1	324
taught by the Greek and Latin churches,	2	330
later writers on,	4	333
Pedobaptist writers on,	1	335
councils, synods and assemblies on,	2	336
denominations on,	1	337
injury done to infants by neglecting,	5	364
Infants members of the visible church, (par. 2,)	8	240
proper subjects of baptism,	1–3	264
in covenant with God,	4	266

	Section.	Page.
Infants are sinful creatures,	2	264
may receive what baptism signifies,	3	265
their baptism taught,	2–7	270
required,	1–6	276
baptized,	3	331
commanded to be baptized,	5	287
never excluded from the covenant or from the use of its seal, (par. 13,)	1	282
in the new covenant, to be baptized,	2	285
prepared for Heaven, to be baptized,	3	286
baptized by John,	4	287
may be taught,	5	289
included in (οικος) house,	6	293
O. T. not more favorable to, than N. (par. 6,)	10	313
Inscriptions, commemorative, on infant baptism,	3	331
Israelites, the, baptized in the cloud and in the sea,	1	12
not immersed,	4	123
were sprinkled,	5	211
James and John were baptized with sufferings,	3	71
Jailer, circumstances of,	6	305
not immersed, (par. 6,)	1	115
his house baptized, (par. 2,)	6	291
Jewish baptism unauthorized,	1–3	72
use of (οικος) house,	6	301
John sprinkled,	4	210
Justin Martyr, on infant baptism, (par. 5,)	1	325
on circumcision, (par. 12,)	1	282
Kingdom of God, infants members of,	8	309
to come, when Christ preached, (par. 3,)	2	18
when John preached, (par. 2,)	2	18
after John's death, (par. 5,)	2	19
Know, those baptized in infancy, that they were,	4	345
Language, of immersers admits sprinkling to be a mode of baptism,	4	155
Latin Dictionaries, on baptize,	2	144
Laymen, not authorized to baptize,	1	74
Law and the prophets, until John,	14	25
Learning,	10	97
Lexicons, Greek, on (βαπτιζω) baptize,	1	141

	Section.	Page.
Liars, habitual, not christians,	3	224
Liberty, not impaired by infant baptism,	10	354
Life, not to be endangered by baptism,	1	121
Little children, an indefinite number baptized,	5	319
Locusts, not to hurt the sealed,	2	358
Lydia, her (οικος) family baptized,	6	290
circumstances of,	6	302
Linguists, 47 of the best on (βαπτιζω) baptize, (par. 5,)	6	120
Martyrs, council of, on infant baptism, (par. 1,)	3	224
Members, church, to be baptized,	1	269
Meso-Gothic language, on baptism,	4	145
Ministers bound in covenant to teach, &c. baptized children,	7	351
Mode of ceremonial washings,	7	202
Modes of baptism,	1–4	76
Multitudes baptized by John,	6	126
Nations baptized by sprinkling,	1	191
Noah in the ark, cannot teach immersion,	9	129
New dispensation did not commence with John,	15	25
Obedience required in baptism,	4	13
to God required in christian baptism,	12, 13	55
Old Testament washings, not by immersion,	16	133
Οικια, οικος, household, house,	6	293
One baptism, mode not mentioned in,	2	63
if only one, that is by sprinkling,	8	214
Opinion of some immersers,	3, 4	155
on baptize,	5	157
of immersers, as to the meaning of (βαπτιζω) the word for baptize,	4	155
Opposition to infant baptism a sin,	6	365
Optatus, on infant baptism, (paragraph 12,)	1	328
Order, proper, requires infant baptism, (par. 4,)	10	312
Ordinance, baptism an instituted,	2	47
Origen, on infant baptism, (par. 8,)	1	326
Originated, when immersion did, in America,	4	181
in Europe,	1	178
in the Greek church,	2	179
as the only mode of baptism,	3	179

	Section.	Page.
Overdress, sometimes used by immersers, (*note a*,)	7	160
Παιδιον, παις, little child, child,	7	307
Πανοικι, the whole house,	6	305
Palestine, immersion not probable in, (par. 4,)	1	114
Parental affection indicates infant baptism,	9	309
Parents bound in covenant to train up their baptized children in the way they should go,	6	350
Parties in the covenant made with the visible church,	8	238
Paul, baptized by sprinkling,	3	210
Pedobaptist writers on immersion,	3	150
infant baptism,	1	335
Point, the, what it is,	3	81
Proselytes, baptism of, by the Jews,	3	73
Questions do not prove immersion,	2	137
of immersers answered,	1	139
Resurrection not symbolized by immersion,	8	166
Roger Williams immersed in Rhode Island,	4	181
Sacrament, baptism a,	10	53
Seal, baptism a,	11	54
to be applied to the forehead,	8	203
sprinkling a baptismal,	8	403
may be changed (par. 9,)	1	280
Seals of the covenant, church members have a right to,	6	237
what they are and were, (par. 10, 11,)	1	280
Simon the sorcerer was baptized,	1	255
Sin of division, who guilty of,	16	248
Sprinkle clear water,	1	189
many nations, he shall,	1	191
Sprinkling as a mode of baptism taught in scripture,	1	189
can become universal,	9	204
the only mode expressly mentioned in scripture,	3	195
the mode, in spiritual baptism,	6	201
a baptismal seal,	8	203
to be applied to the forehead,	8	203
John's mode of baptism,	4	210
the mode of performing ceremonial washings,	7	202
commanded in scripture,	12	206

	Section.	Page.
Sprinkling taught, when baptism with water is required,	13	207
Christ was baptized by,	1	207
Israel was baptized by,	5	211
the Eunuch was baptized by,	2	209
if but one mode of baptism that is by,	8	214
Paul was baptized by,	3	210
proved by every example of baptism,	6	213
scriptural evidence for, full,	7	214
a meaning of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize,	1	141
a mode of baptism, taught by Greek Lexicons,	2	215
by Hebrew Lexicons,	3	216
by other Lexicons and Dictionaries,	1	216
is the scriptural meaning of the word (βαπτιζω) for baptize,	2	192
taught in the Hebrew Bible,	3	196
in the Septuagint,	4	198
in the New Testament, (par. 8,)	2	193
in the Apocrypha,	1	216
by the Greek fathers,	2	217
by other Greek writers,	1	141
by Latin fathers,	3	218
by Pedobaptists,	4	219
by ancient engravings,	5	221
by christians generally,	1	222
by councils, synods and assemblies,	3	224
by many large denominations,	2	222
Substitute for christian baptism,	8	43
Swedish word for baptize, its meaning,	4	145
Synod of Cambridge on baptism,	3	224
Dort or Dordrecht on baptism,	3	224
Tables baptized, not immersed,	8	121
Taufen, the German word for baptize,	3	144
τεχνιον, τεχνον, τεχνοω,	7	307
Tertullian on infant baptism, (par. 7,)	1	326
Translators of the scriptures, (par. 5,)	6	120
Unity of the Old and New Testament church,	1	283
Valid baptism, what necessary to,	4	257
what not necessary to,	1	254

	Section.	Page.
Various kinds of immersion,	4	77
Washing not immersion,	5	106
once preceded baptism,	1	160
Water, the emblem to be used in baptism,	4	48
Westminster assembly on baptism, (par. 6,)	3	224
What is done in immersion,	4	78
Young children in the jailer's family,	6	304
in Lydia's family,	6	302
Zosimus, a present from,	3	162

ERRATA.

A very few typographical errors have escaped the notice of the printers. The reader will please to correct the following:

Page 11, § 2, line 10, for "be baptized," read "baptize."

Page 30, § 1, line 4, for "righteous," read "righteousness."

Page 113, § 1, line 5, for "these," read "there."

Page 148, § 1, line 4, for υσατος read υδατος.

Page 219, § 3, last line, for "made," read "mode."

Page 321, § 1, (*note*) for "cintauchen," read "eintauchen."

Page 332, § 3, par. 5, for "Maureutius," read "Maurentius."

Perhaps a few other errors may be found in the book.